

*Some  
Modern  
Isms*



BL 98 .J6 1919

Johnson, Thomas Cary, 1859-  
1936.

Some modern isms














# Some Modern Isms

BY

THOS. CARY JOHNSON

Author of "*The Southern Presbyterian Church*," "*John Calvin and the Genevan Reformation*," "*The Life and Letters of Robert Lewis Dabney*," "*The Life and Letters of Benjamin Morgan Palmer*," "*Virginia Presbyterianism and Religious Liberty*," "*Introduction to Christian Missions*," "*Baptist in the Apostolic Age*."

PRESBYTERIAN COMMITTEE OF PUBLICATION,

RICHMOND, VA.



Copyright, 1919  
by  
Thos. C. Johnson



This Book is Dedicated to  
My Wife  
Whose Sympathy is  
An Unfailing Help.





## PREFACE

---

The lectures in this volume, on Mormonism, on Christian Science, and on Russellism, were delivered to the Senior Class in Union Theological Seminary in Virginia, in January, 1918. Many who heard them suggested that they should be published. Brethren here and there throughout the Church have suggested the same thing. The present Senior Class, through a spokesman, has formally asked that they be printed, if practicable, before January, 1919. In compliance with these suggestions and requests, those lectures are now offered for publication.

Along with them a brief discussion of some wayward offspring of Christian Science—*New Thoughtism*, and the ism of *The Unity School of Christianity*—and a discussion of Nietzscheism, are included in this volume.

It is hoped that they will give a clear understanding of the several issues dealt with, and serve to rescue some who would otherwise fall into these errors.

A full and fair statement of the major isms has been attempted. If rebutted statements are often brief, it is because the fair statement of the ism should kill it with thoughtful readers.

October 10, 1918.

# Contents

---

- I. MORMONISM.
- II. EDDYISM, OR CHRISTIAN SCIENCE.
- III. WAYWARD CHILDREN OF MOTHER EDDY; OR THE NEW  
THOUGHT PEOPLE'S ISM; AND THE ISM OF THE  
UNITY SCHOOL OF CHRISTIANITY.
- IV. RUSSELLISM.
- V. NIETZSCHEISM.

# Literature on Mormonism

---

## BOOK OF MORMON

Orson Pratt: *Pamphlets*, Liverpool, 1857.

Mrs. T. B. Stenhouse: *Tell It All*.

Progress, No. 11, Vol. III.: *The Mormon Church*.

John Doyle Lee: *The Mormon Menace*.

J. W. Gunnison: *The Mormons*.

Encyclopedia, *Sub Voce Mormonism*.



# Mormonism

---

On the 23d day of December, in the year of our Lord 1805, Joseph Smith was born at Sharon, Windsor County, Vermont, of poor, ignorant, thriftless and not over honest parents. Along with them he removed, ten years later, to a poor farm in the western part of the State of New York, where he reproduced the shiftlessness, ignorance, meanness and dishonesty of his parents in his own character. For years in his youth and early manhood he spent much time in befooling men and defrauding them, by pretending that, through the aid of a marvelous stone which he possessed, he could discover hidden treasures, gold mines and the like.\* For such practices he was brought before a justice of the peace in Bainbridge, Chenango County, New York, on the 20th day of March, 1826, and adjudged guilty of being a disorderly person and an imposter.

Meanwhile the region in which he lived had been visited by a religious revival when he was about fifteen years of age, and his own mind had been wildly agitated.

Under the influence of this religious excitement several members of the Smith family joined the Presbyterian Church. But Joseph was more inclined to the Methodists. He tells us that he prayed much to be guided aright; that he was greatly perplexed by the numbers and varieties of the sects; and that he saw none that seemed to be correct. He would have us believe that, like Mohammed, whom he more nearly resembled in the ethical features of his teachings than any other with whom we could compare him, he was dissatisfied with every form of Christianity which he knew, on the one

---

\*See Gunnison: The History of the Mormons, pp. 88 ff.

hand, and equally dissatisfied on the other with Judaism as he saw it.

He tells us, also, that he began to see visions from this time on, and that in one of these visions, which occurred on the night of the 21st of September, 1823, the angel Moroni appeared to him three times, and told him that the Bible of the Western Continent, the supplement to the New Testament, was buried near the adjacent town of Manchester, and that thither in 1827, after the necessary disciplinary probation, he went and received from an angel a stone box, in which was a volume six inches thick, made of thin gold plates 8 inches by 7, and fastened together by three rings; that the plates were covered with small writing in the "reformed Egyptian" tongue, and that there was with them a pair of supernatural spectacles, in the shape of two crystals set in a silver bow, and called "Urim and Thummin." As the illiterate Smith could hardly write, he employed as amanuensis Oliver Cowdery, to whom, from behind a curtain, he dictated, as he claimed, a translation of the unsealed contents of the plates. With the aid of a farmer of some means, Martin Harris, the copy thus produced by Oliver Cowdery was printed and published in 1830, under the title of "The Book of Mormon."

It was prefaced by the sworn statement of Oliver Cowdery, David Whitmer and Martin Harris, that an angel of God had shown them the plates of which the book was a translation.

This book—the so-called "Book of Mormon"—in which Joseph Smith is declared to be God's prophet, with all power, and entitled to all obedience, tells us that certain Hebrews settled in America in 600 B. C.; that they subsequently divided over a question of leadership, and that the victorious party, which was also the party of insubordination to God, suffered the darkening of their skins as a curse for

their insubordination and became the red Indians of America. It tells us that subsequently the party of the servants of the Lord became still smaller through apostasy and that finally it was destroyed by the Indian Hebrews in the year 384, A. D.; but that among the few who escaped destruction were Mormon and his son Moroni; that Mormon collected the sixteen books of record, kept by successive kings and priests, into one volume, and that Moroni supplemented the work of Mormon by some personal reminiscences and then hid the volume in the hill of Cumorah, being assured of its going, one day, to be discovered by God's chosen prophet.

Such is the account of the water-wizzard, the cheat and the fraud, Joseph Smith, as to the origin of the "Book of Mormon." In a part of this account he was at first supported by the sworn statement of his three friends, Cowdery, Whitmer and Harris. But some years later, all three of these renounced Mormonism and denounced their oaths as false.

There is little reason for believing that Joseph Smith ever was as profoundly agitated on the subject of religion as he professed; there is still less reason for believing that he made an intelligent study of either Christianity or Judaism, and thus intelligently rejected them as insufficient. There is the best evidence for believing that the "Book of Mormon" came not through angelic ministrations, but in quite a different way.

The most of this book seems to have been written by an invalid and crack-brained Presbyterian preacher, Solomon Spalding, by name, to while away the tedious hours of his invalid years. He had been accustomed to maintain that the Indians of America were descendants of some of the Israelitish tribes, and, in a period of infirm health, he wrote a romance to support his views. He called his work the "Manuscript Found," and tried, but in vain, to find a publisher.

This work appears to have fallen into the hands of Smith, and after some slight manipulations, to have come out the "Book of Mormon."

That Spalding's romance was the original of the "Book of Mormon," was the confident affirmation of contemporaries of Joseph Smith, who had examined both books. And these men not only asserted such a relation between the "Manuscript Found" and the "Book of Mormon," but they proved it by pointing to numerous and distinctive names, phrases, characters and stories in Spalding's\* manuscript which re-appear as distinctive in Smith's work. And so strong do they make their case that Gentile historians of Mormonism generally, and perhaps universally, agree in taking this view of the origin of the so-called "Book of Mormon," as the most probable.

Joseph Smith gave his people not only the "Book of Mormon." In 1830, he claimed to have received another revelation proclaiming him "seer, translator, prophet, apostle of Jesus Christ, and elder of the Church." The revelations, thus begun, continued to his death, in 1844. They include that which sanctions polygamy and which was privately given, in the year 1843, to pacify his lawful wife and to silence the objections of the saints to his living with a number of women whom he had persuaded to worse than polygamous relations. For reasons of policy this revelation was not published abroad for ten years, not until 1853. These revelations to Smith, together with one to Brigham Young, written and published by him at "Winter Quarters," in the year 1847, to inspire and guide the saints in their projected western pilgrimage through the wilderness, were collected and published under the title of the "Book of Doctrine and Covenants."

We suppose an up-to-date "Book of Doctrine and Cove-

---

\*Gunnison: *Ibid.*, pp. 93-96.



nants" would include several other revelations, as for instance, one which, while still justifying polygamy as ethically proper, advised its cessation, as a condition necessary, in order to the admission of Utah to Statehood!

These are the two distinctive books of the Mormons.

They comprise their "inspired writings," which, as "modern revelations," they place alongside the ancient scriptures "properly translated," contained in the Old and New Testaments. In theory the Mormons hold the Bible "properly translated," the Christian Bible, the "Book of Mormon" and the "Book of Doctrine and Covenants" to be the God-given scriptures of authority and direction. They hold that the Old Testament was addressed particularly to the Jewish Church; that the New Testament was similarly addressed to the Judaic and European Christian Church; the "Book of Mormon" to the American Christian Church, and the "Book of Doctrine and Covenants" to the Church of Jesus Christ of The Latter Day Saints.\*

We must not, however, think of their canon as being as important to them as ours to us. They believe that continuous revelation is necessary; that "without new revelation their officers never could be qualified to perform the various duties of their calling." There is no other people more completely under the domination of their priesthood. It is unlike Christianity in this respect.

In theory, nevertheless, Mormonism is Christianity perfected. It is the theory and the boast of Mormons that, as Christianity surpasses the religion of the Jewish Dispensation, so Mormonism surpasses Christianity. And as a matter of fact, Mormon teachers are constantly making false appeals to the Christian Scriptures in order to establish Mormonism,

---

\*With this historical sketch of Smith and the books, compare the account of Bishop Daniel S. Tuttle on "Mormons" in Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia, the article in the Encyclopedia Britanica, and especially Orson Pratt's Work, Tract No. 6, "Remarkable Visions."

as Paul indubitably proved the truth of Christianity from the Old Testament. Mormon propagandist literature is chock full of references to the Old and New Testament, illustrating with indefinite fulness the pregnant saying, "In religion, what damned error but some sober brow will bless it and approve it with a text?" Not one of the college of the apostles quoted scripture with greater show of unction. But this Mormon unction is the unction of the deceived, or the hypocrite; and the theory of Mormonism, that it is a legitimate development of Christianity, is false. The distinctive teachings of Mormonism are in direct and absolute antagonism to those of Christianity.\*

Let us examine them briefly: In the first place, the Mormon notion of God, is that of an immense material substance, with only parts of it personalized. Naïve Materialism, tritheism with two only out of the three gods personal, and progressively increasing polytheism are scrouged into this notion of God or Gods. But let Mormonism speak for itself:

In "an epitome of the faith of "The Latter Day Saints," prepared by Joseph Smith himself, the first article reads, "We believe in God, the Eternal Father, and in His Son, Jesus Christ, and in the Holy Ghost." This article in the Mormon mouth means something very different from what it does when pronounced by a Christian. Orson Pratt, perhaps the most eloquent and able of the expounders of Mormonism, an apostle, and claiming inspiration, says "The Godhead consists of the Father; the Son, and the Holy Spirit. The Father is a material being. The substance of which he is composed is wholly material. It is a substance widely different in some respects from the various substances with which we are more immediately acquainted. In other

---

\*The Mormonism herein discussed is Mormonism of the later days of Joseph Smith and of the time of Bingham Young and since.

respects it is precisely like all other materials. The substance of his person like other matter, cannot be in two places at the same instant. It also requires time for him to transport himself from place to place. It matters not how great the velocity of his movements, time is an essential ingredient to all motion, whether rapid or slow. It differs from other matter in the superiority of its powers, being intelligent, all-wise, and possessing the power of self-motion to a far greater extent than the coarser materials of nature. God is a Spirit, but that does not make him an immaterial being—a being that has no properties in common with matter. The expression, an immaterial being is a contradiction in terms. Immateriality is only another name for nothing. It is the negative of all existence. A spirit is as much matter as oxygen or hydrogen. It has many properties in common with matter. . . . He is not a being without parts, as modern idolaters teach: for every whole is made up of parts. The whole person of the Father consists of innumerable parts; and each part is so situated as to bear certain relations of distance to every other part. There must also be, to a certain degree, a freedom of motion among those parts, which is an essential condition to the movement of his limbs, without which he could only move as a whole.

“All the foregoing statements in relation to the person of the Father, are equally applicable to the person of the Son.

“The Holy Spirit being one part of the Godhead, is also a material substance, of the same nature and properties in many respects, as the Spirits of the Father and the Son. It exists in vast immeasurable quantities in connection with all material worlds. This is called God in the Scriptures, as well as the Father and the Son; God the Father and God the Son cannot be everywhere present; indeed they cannot

be even in two places at the same instant; but God the Holy Spirit is omnipresent—it extends through all space, intermingling with all other matter, yet no one atom of the Holy Spirit can be in two places at the same instant, which in all cases is an absolute impossibility. It must exist in inexhaustible quantities, which is the only possible way for any substance to be omnipresent. All the innumerable phenomena of universal nature are produced in their origin by the actual presence of this intelligent, all-wise and all-powerful material substance called the Holy Spirit. It is the most active matter in the universe, producing all its operations according to fixed and definite laws enacted by itself, in conjunction with the Father and Son. What are called the laws of nature are nothing more nor less than the fixed method by which this spiritual matter operates. Each atom of the Holy Spirit is intelligent, and like all other matter, has solidity, form and size, and occupies space. Two atoms of this Spirit cannot occupy the same space at the same time; neither can one atom, as before stated, occupy two separate spaces at the same time. . . . If several of the atoms of this Spirit should unite themselves together into the form of a person, then the person of the Holy Spirit would be subject to the same necessity as the other two persons of the Godhead, that is, it could not be everywhere present. No finite number of atoms can be omnipresent; an infinite number of atoms is required to be everywhere in infinite space. Two persons receiving the gift of the Holy Spirit, do not each receive at the same time the same identical particles, though they each receive a substance exactly similar in kind. It would be as impossible for each to receive the same identical atoms, as it would be for two men at the same time to drink the same identical pint of water.”\*

\*Orson Pratt: “Kingdom of God.” Part I, p. 49. In “Series of Pamphlets.” Liverpool, 1857.

In his treatise, "The Kingdom of God," Part IV., p. 15, the "inspired apostle," Pratt, gives a summary of his doctrine of God. He says: "We have endeavored to point out the nature and character of the great supreme governing power of the universe, consisting of the Father, Son and the Holy Ghost. The person of the Father consists of a most glorious substance, called spirit, which we have shown must have extension and parts, and consequently must be material. Without these qualities no substance could exist.

"The Son is the express image of the Father, and is also a material being. The same material body that was crucified and laid in the tomb, rose again. The same flesh, the same bones, were reanimated by the same material spirit. This glorious compound of flesh and bones, and spirit—all material, ascended into heaven to dwell in the presence of the glorious personage of the Father, of whose express image and likeness he was the most perfect pattern. Therefore from the description given of Jesus we are irresistibly led to the conclusion that both he and the Father must appear, so far as relates to form and size, very much like man. If then both these glorious personages are about the size of man, they must, like man, occupy a finite space of but a few cubic feet in dimension; and according to the admitted truths of philosophy, no substance can be in two or more places at the same time, therefore neither the Father nor Son can, consistently with those truths, be in two places at once. Revealed truths never will contradict any other truths. The revealed truths contained in the Bible inform us that God is everywhere, sustaining and upholding all things, and that in him we live and move and have our being. How can those important truths of divine revelation be reconciled with other admitted truths of philosophy which are equally certain? They can be reconciled in no way except by admitting the omnipresence of the Holy Spirit. This all-

powerful substance extends throughout the material universe, uniting and mingling with all other matter in a greater or less degree, not absolutely filling all space, for then there would be no room for other matter, but like the rays of light or heat, existing in different degrees of density in different parts of space. By it all things are governed in the most perfect order and wisdom, according to the will of the Father and the Son. This view of the subject does not necessarily do away with a personal spirit, acting in conjunction with the other two persons of the Godhead; for myriads of personal spirits could be organized out of the inexhaustible quantities which exist, and still an abundance would be left to govern and control the various departments of the universe where those personages could not always be present."

In another passage the great expounder of Mormonism exclaims at an enemy for not seeing that the Holy Spirit, if a person, could not be omnipresent.\*

Similarly in a so-called "Revelation" to Joseph Smith, dated December 27th, 1832, the omnipresence of God by his Spirit universally diffused, is taught. There is no shadow of ground for doubt that Pratt expounded the Mormon doctrine of God in harmony with Smith's teaching.

Thus we have, in this beggar's basket of a doctrine of God, the assertion of absolute materiality, on the supposition that matter is the only substance. We have two personal Gods—God the Father and God the Son—stripped of the attribute of omnipresence and by implication and logic of every divine attribute. Personality is denied the Spirit on the ground that to make him personal would be to make him finite. He is turned into It.

What a hotch-potch! An infinite, material, impersonal God—a sort of material soul of the world—two material,

---

\*Orson Pratt: "Absurdities of Immaterialism," p. 25. In a Series of Pamphlets. Liverpool. 1857.

finite, personal Gods, making materialism, tritheism, practical atheism.

But this Mormon theology—these bizarre, confused and conflicting representations of God became still more grotesque, absurd and contradictory when Brigham Young, the “Prophet of the Lord” who succeeded Joseph Smith, publicly taught as he did on the 9th of April, 1852: “When our father Adam came into the Garden of Eden, he came into it with a celestial body, and brought Eve, one of his wives, with him. He helped to make and organize this world. He is Michael the Archangel, the Ancient of Days, about whom holy men have written and spoken. He is our Father and our God, and the only God with whom we have to do.”\* Mrs. T. B. H. Stenhouse, in her work, “Tell It All,” or “The Story of a Life’s Experience in Mormonism,” after quoting these words of Brigham Young’s, says: “This public declaration gave great offense and led to the apostasy of many. Nevertheless, Brigham Young thinks that just as Adam came down to Eden and subsequently became a God, in like manner he also himself will attain to the Godhead. Heber C. Kimball, zealous to go a step further, declared that Brigham was God, ‘and that he (Kimball) stood towards him in the same relation as the Third Person in the Blessed Trinity does toward the First.’”†

Dr. Sheldon Jackson, ex-Moderator of the Presbyterian Church North, who “was for twenty years a missionary among the Mormons,” says of Mormonism: “God (God the Father) is none other than Adam the first man. Adam married many wives here and begot many children. He died, went to heaven and was made God of Earth because of his many wives and children. He has many wives in heaven and begets many children there still. Every man after death

---

\*Mrs. T. B. H. Stenhouse: “Tell It All,” pp. 299-300.

†Mrs. T. B. H. Stenhouse: “Tell It All,” p. 300.

is God over a world, the magnitude of which is proportioned to the number of wives and children he has here. If he has many wives and children here he will be a god over a large kingdom hereafter." \* Thus gods of smaller size than the Father and the Son are growing daily.

Mrs. Stenhouse says, and truly: "The Confession of Faith published by Joseph Smith during his life time, would certainly deceive an uninitiated person; and it was in consequence of the ambiguity of that very document, that so many unsuspecting persons were from the beginning of Mormonism led astray by the teachings of the missionaries. The convert was told that Mormon faith proclaimed the existence of one true God, but he was not told that Father Adam was that deity, and that he is 'like a well-to-do-farmer.' He was told that Christ was the Son of God, but he was not taught that the Virgin Mary was 'the lawful wife of God the Father,' and that he intended after the resurrection to take her again as one of his own wives, to raise up immortal spirits in eternity. . . . He was taught that the saints believed in the Holy Ghost, but he was not told that the Holy Ghost is a man, (i. e., that a personalized part of the Holy Ghost is a man) and our God. You think our Father and our God is not a lively, sociable and cheerful man. He is one of the most lively men that ever lived."†

If Dr. Sheldon Jackson can be trusted, Mrs. Stenhouse might have gone still further. She might have said: "Though they taught men to have faith in Christ, they did not teach that the marriage in Cana of Galilee was Christ's own marriage; that the Marys and Marthas of the New Testament were wives of his, and that he begat many children and still begets children in heaven."\* These esoteric teachings of

\*Private Report of Dr. Jackson's Address, by Mr. R. W. Jopling.

†Mrs. T. B. H. Stenhouse: "Tell It All," p. 296.

\*Private Report of Dr. Jackson's Address, by Mr. R. W. Jopling.



Mormonism were left to be unfolded later, to those within the pale.

Now place, if you please, alongside this mass of drivelling assumption, of discordant, rampant and warring blasphemy, of materialism, bi-personality, tri-personality according to some later teaching of the tabernacle, impersonality of the Spirit according to Joseph Smith and Orson Pratt, ditheism, tritheism, polytheism, atheism, (for these gods are but men) place, if you please, alongside this refuse heap of ribald fancy the Christian conception of God: "God is a Spirit, infinite, eternal, and unchangeable in his being, wisdom, power, holiness, justice, goodness and truth." "There are three persons in the Godhead: the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost; and these three are one God the same in substance equal in power and glory."

The Mormon degradation and defamation of the notion of God marks it as no development of Christianity, but a most foul and blasphemous apostasy.

In the second place, the Mormon anthropology includes the doctrines of the soul's divine origin and nature, its materiality, its pre-existence, its fall which they regard as no more serious than Pelagians say, and its entire ability to save itself, once Christ has died, and to make for itself an estate of material happiness in the world to come.

Says Elder Franklin D. Richards, of Salt Lake City: "Mormonism teaches that the spirit of man is the off-spring of God and existed as a living entity before incorporation into a mortal body." † In "Revelation of May 6, 1833," Joseph Smith teaches that the spirits of men are the offspring of God in these words: "And now verily I say unto you, I was in the beginning with the Father and am the first born; and all those who are together through me are partakers of the glory of the same and are the Church of the First Born.

---

†In Progress. No. 11. Vol. III. Art, "The Mormon Church."

Ye were also in the beginning with the Father.”\* Mrs. Stenhouse says, “The soul was said to be immortal, and to have three stages of existence. The first was the purely spiritual stage—the stage of the soul before it came into this world. Spirits in that condition were not perfect. They must first take a fleshly body and pass through the trials of life before they could attain to the highest state of existence. Hence it was the solemn duty of, as well as the highest privilege of men, to practice polygamy; their duty, as by this means, and this alone, the yet imperfect souls, now waiting to come into this world, could ever hope to be admitted into the “Celestial Kingdom,”—and a privilege, as all the souls whom they thus assisted to emigrate, would form their own “kingdoms” in eternity, over which as kings and priests they would reign forever and ever.

“The second stage of the soul’s existence is the mortal, with which we are all sadly acquainted. The third is the condition subsequent to the Resurrection, when they believe the flesh and bones will form the raised body, but that the blood will not be there; for the blood is the principle of the corrupt life, and therefore another spirit supplies its place in heaven.

“That Christ partook of some broiled fish and part of a honey comb is evident from Holy Scripture. The Mormons therefore teach that heaven will be very much the same as earth, only considerably improved. We shall not marry there or be given in marriage; hence it is necessary for us to marry here, and to marry as much as we can, for then in heaven the man will take the wives whom he had married on earth, or who have been sealed to him by proxy; they will be his queens and their children will be his subjects. We shall eat and drink and spend a happy time generally. We shall thenceforth never die—thence we shall ourselves be Gods!

---

\*Quoted “In Progress.” Vol. III. No. 11, p. 686.

"It was in the pre-existent state, the Mormon tells us, that the work of salvation was first planned—but not after the fashion believed by all Christians. A grand celestial council was held, at which all the sons of God appeared. Michael the father of all, presided and stated that he proposed to create a new world, of which he proceeded to give some details. His first begotten then arose, and made a speech in which he proposed that Michael, his father, should go down to the world, when created, with Eve his mother, and do there much after the fashion of what is related of our first parents in the book of Genesis; he himself would descend some thousands of years subsequently, and would lead his erring brethren back, and save them from their sins. Lucifer the second son then stood forth and unfolded his plan. Jealous of the popularity of his brother, he proposed to save men in their sins.

"Great discussion ensued, in which the unnumbered family of heaven divided into three parties—one under each of the two elder sons, and the third standing neutral. After a terrible conflict, the second son, was defeated, and with all his followers was driven out of heaven. They descended into the abyss where they founded the infernal kingdom, of which Lucifer became the chief. He was henceforth known as the Devil. (Michael or) Adam created his world and carried out his part of the plan; and in due time the eldest son, who conquered in heaven, took upon him the form of flesh, dwelt among men and was known as their Redeemer. The spirits who stood neutral during the conflict subsequently took upon them forms of flesh, entering into the children of Ham, and were known as negroes. Therefore it is, that although the American Indians and all other races are eligible for the Mormon priesthood, the negro alone can never attain to that high dignity."\* Such is the Mormon anthropology.

---

\*Mrs. T. B. H. Stenhouse: "Tell It All," pp. 297-299.

Since the time of Plato, and perhaps before, the intellectual world has been acquainted with the fancy of the pre-existence of souls and has regarded it as baseless. But the Mormons suppose all souls to have existed eternally and in an imperfect state. In the first pair on earth, their Father, God, Michael, Adam, or whatever he may be called, and his wife, the race fell further, but owing to the redemptive work of Christ no man suffers for this primeval earth's sin. They teach that men are naturally able to comply with the requirements which entitle to salvation.† They teach a view of heavenly man about as grossly sensual as the Mohammedans, but in other respects like the Pelagians.

Compare now with this puerile, superficial, absurd and palpably false, vagarious, and heathen view of man, with its accompanying defamation of God, the Christian doctrine as to man's creation, fall, sinfulness, moral helplessness, salvation by grace if at all, freedom in Christ, everything through Christ:

"God created man male and female, after his own image, in knowledge, righteousness and holiness. When God created man, he entered into a covenant of life with him on condition of perfect obedience. Our first parents, being left to the freedom of their own will, fell from the estate wherein they were created by sinning against God. The fall brought mankind into an estate of sin and misery. The sinfulness of that estate whereinto man fell, consisted of the guilt of Adam's first sin, the want of original righteousness, and the corruption of his whole nature, which is commonly called original sin, together with all actual transgressions which proceed from it. But God, having out of his mere good pleasure from all eternity elected some to everlasting life, did enter into a covenant of grace, to deliver them out of the estate of sin and misery, and to bring them into an estate of salvation by a Redeemer."

---

†Compare Ben. E. Rich: "A Friendly Discussion," p. 11.

Christianity teaches that man was created by God. It teaches the doctrine of *ex nihilo* creation. Mormonism teaches the eternity of matter, and regards the souls of men as a part of that eternal matter. Christianity teaches that mankind fell in Adam, our ancestral head, from an estate of holiness. Mormonism teaches that souls in an imperfect state were embodied as a necessary stage in their progress toward perfection. Christianity teaches the moral helplessness of man and the need of divine grace in order to salvation. Mormonism teaches that man can do everything necessary to salvation once the eldest son of the Michael, who became Adam, has died in the race's behalf. Mormonism looks forward to a heaven of sensuality much like that of Mohammed. Christianity looks forward to a heaven in which fleshly appetites have no scope. Mormonism is no development of Christianity. It is another gospel than that which Paul preached.

In the *third place*, the Mormon doctrines of soteriology are equally crude and unchristian.

Joseph Smith says, in his Articles of Faith, "We believe that, through the atonement of Christ, all mankind may be saved, by obedience to the laws and ordinances of the Gospel. We believe that these ordinances are: First, faith in the Lord Jesus Christ; second, repentance; third, baptism by immersion for remission of sins; fourth, laying on of hands for the gift of the Holy Ghost."\*

The theory of the Mormons is that the sacrifice of Christ so far does away with the effect of Adams' sins that all men suffer for their own individual sins only. Moreover the sacrificial death of Christ, they teach, so far clears the way that man can save himself. They describe faith as follows: They who believe "Must believe, first, in the existence of God; secondly, in his revealed law; and thirdly, in

---

\*Articles of Faith, 3 and 4.

the sufferings of the Son of God"\* as satisfying divine justice. They define repentance with more apparent adequacy. They teach that immersion is the only mode of baptism sanctioned by our Lord. They say also that "baptism is not, as many false teachers now affirm, 'an outward sign of an invisible grace,' but is an ordinance whereby a believing penitent obtains a forgiveness of all past sins."† They thus teach the *ex opere operato* theory of the efficiency of the sacrament. They make water baptism to be essential to salvation, as well as baptism with the Holy Ghost. Joseph Smith teaches this in "Revelation" dated November, 1831. He represents Christ as saying, "Verily, verily, I say unto you, they that believe not on your words and are not baptized in water in my name for the remission of their sins, that they may receive the Holy Ghost, shall be damned and shall not come into my father's kingdom."‡ The Mormons also teach that after a man has believed and repented and been baptized for the remission of sins, he must then receive the Holy Ghost by the laying on of hands,§ and so be empowered to heal the sick and work miracles generally.

Now observe that this soteriology of Mormonism is fundamentally unlike that of Christianity. The Christian system is the plan of the uncreated and independent tri-personal God for saving one who is a creature in the absolute sense of the term creature. The Mormon system is the plan by which persons called "eternal" try to save other beings equally eternal and uncreated. Christianity represents the atonement as an infinite satisfaction by a person of the triune Godhead to divine justice, for the sin of finite beings. Mormonism represents the atonement as a satisfaction by one of two persons clothed, inconsistently, with some of the

---

\*Orson Pratt: "Kingdom of God." Part II, pp. 3, 4.

†Orson Pratt: "Kingdom of God." Part II, pp. 4, 5.

‡Quoted in Progress. Vol. III. No. 11, p. 687.

§Ben. E. Rich: "A Friendly Discussion," pp. 15, 16.

divine attributes for the sin of beings not their creatures, and also clothed with the same metaphysical attributes. Mormonism represents faith as purely intellectual. Christianity represents it as of the heart as well as the head. We distinguish between the mere historical faith of the intellect which even devils may have and that faith of the mind and heart and whole man which the child of God must have. Repentance in the two systems, notwithstanding any superficial likeness, is essentially unlike, since God, sin and sinner, are different things as seen by Mormons and by the teachings of Christianity. The Mormons clothe baptism with water with an efficiency which is never affirmed nor implied of it in Scriptures, and which is never taught even by any branch of nominal Christians but the most apostate and superstitious. Nay, it may be doubted whether any branch of the nominally Christian church, even the most apostate and degraded, has taught sacramentalism so fully. The Mormons are like a few Christian enthusiasts indeed, in claiming that the maraculous gifts of the apostolic age are continued in this age. But here, too, they stand in sharp contrast to the very best and noblest part of the Christian church in all ages and countries save the darkest.

But we are not yet done with the Mormon soteriology. They tell us that "the living saints may perform ordinances for the repentant dead." And as a matter of fact the discovery of repentance on the part of the dead does not seem difficult. Accordingly, Queen Anne of England, George Washington, Napoleon Bonaparte, and how many others time would fail us to tell, have been baptized by proxy into the Mormon communion.

Marriage is an element in Mormon soteriology. They call it a sacrament. They say "it is solemnized for time and for eternity. It is sealed on earth by one having divine authority, and it is therefore sealed in heaven. . . .

This union of the sexes is essential to perfect exaltation in the celestial world. The marriage does not take place in or after the resurrection, but in this life, where the parties are tested in their probation. Those persons who arrive at no higher conditions than that of angels, are ministering spirits unto the sons and daughters of God."\* That is, those who are not married after the Mormon fashion shall be underlings, scullions and kitchen-maids in heaven. For woman or man, according to Mormonism, the way to the heaven of heavens is through marriage. Those who do not marry, even if they reach the celestial portals, must be hewers of wood, drawers of water, attendants and boot-blacks to the saints.†

We have now passed in rapid review the Mormon doctrines of God, of man, and of salvation. We have seen that instead of holding to Christian theism, they hold to materialism, tritheism in union with the impersonality of one of the gods, the other two gods being little more than indefinitely big men. We have seen that they make man an eternal material being, who existed before he was clothed with flesh, who was clothed with flesh in order to improvement of character, and getting rid of original imperfections, but who tumbled into more trouble in the person of God the Father who became Adam, but was redeemed by his eldest son who became Christ, and hence is able to work out his own salvation by obeying gospel ordinances. We have seen that they make this Christ work out a sort of an atonement; that they then condition a man's salvation on his entertaining intellectual faith,\* on his having repented of his past and determined to live according to their teachings, on baptism by water, on receiving the miraculous pow-

---

\*Elder F. D. Richards: "In Progress." Vol. III. No. 11, p. 685. See also, "Tell It All," p. 257.

†See "Tell It All," p. 257.

\*The uninspired elder, Ben. E. Rich, has a better view of faith.



ers of the Holy Ghost by the imposition of hands, and on his marrying under the Mormon authorities.

This system has no kinship with Christianity. As the "Book of Mormon" uses a few phrases found frequently in our Sacred Scriptures, such as, "And it came to pass," so the Mormon system is set forth by the use of our Christian terminology in part. As we have the words God, Lord, Christ, man, sin, salvation, atonement, faith, repentance, baptism, and so forth, so Mormonism has these words. But the meanings in every case are different. Mormonism is no development of Christianity, but the contrary. It is a religion as unchristian as Manichæism, or Mohammedanism. It is a true child of its founder, Joseph Smith, the cheat, the fraud, the liar and the devotee of lust.

The essentially contra-Christian character of Mormonism may be shown still more convincingly by examining some distinctive peculiarities of Mormon ethics, viz.: polygamy, and the unusual distinction between innocent and guilty blood, the blood atonement or the principle that the end justifies the means.

In 1843, in Nauvoo, Joseph Smith claimed to receive a revelation from God sanctioning a plurality of wives. The revelation is long, full of argument and assertions warranting polygamy. Paragraphs 20 to 25 read as follows:

"Verily, I say unto you, a commandment I give unto mine handmaid, Emma Smith, your wife. . . . Let mine handmaid, Emma Smith, receive all those that have been given unto my servant Joseph, and who are virtuous and pure before me; and those that are not pure and have said that they were pure, shall be destroyed, saith the Lord your God. . . . I give unto my servant Joseph that he may be made ruler over many things, for he hath been faithful over a few things, and from henceforth I will strengthen him.

“And I command mine handmaid, Emma Smith, to abide and cleave unto my servant Joseph, and to no one else. But if she will not abide this commandment, she shall be destroyed, saith the Lord; for I am the Lord thy God, and will destroy her if she abide not in my law; but if she will abide this commandment, then shall my servant Joseph do all things for her even as he hath said; and I will bless him, and multiply him, and give unto him a hundred fold in this world, of fathers and mothers, brothers and sisters, houses and lands, wives and children, and crowns of eternal lives in the eternal world. And, again, verily I say, let mine handmaid forgive my servant Joseph his trespasses, and then shall she be forgiven her trespasses, wherein she has trespassed against me; and I, the Lord thy God, will bless her, and multiply her, and make her heart to rejoice.

“And again, as pertaining to the law of the priesthood: If any man espouse a virgin, and desire to espouse another, and the first give her consent, and if he espouse the second, and they are virgins and have vowed to no other man, then is he justified; he cannot commit adultery, for they are given him, and to none else; and if he have ten virgins given unto him by this law, he cannot commit adultery, for they belong to him; and they are given unto him—therefore he is justified. But if one or either of the ten virgins, after she is espoused, shall be with another man, she has committed adultery; she shall be destroyed; for they are given unto him to multiply and replenish the earth, according to my commandments, and to fulfill the promise which was given by my Father before the foundation of the world; and for their exaltation in the eternal worlds, that they may bear the souls of men; for herein is the work of my Father continued that he may be glorified.

“And again, verily, verily I say unto you, if any man

have a wife who holds the keys of this power, and he teaches unto her the law of my priesthood, as pertaining to these things, then shall she believe and administer unto him, or she shall be destroyed, saith the Lord your God; for I will destroy her; for I will magnify my name upon all those who receive and abide by my law. Therefore, it shall be lawful for him to receive all things whatsoever I the Lord his God, will give unto him, because she did not believe and administer unto him, according to my word, and she then becomes the transgressor, and he is exempt from the law of Sarah, who administered unto Abraham according to the law, when I commanded Abraham to take Hagar to wife. And now, as pertaining to this law: Verily, verily I say unto you, I will reveal more unto you hereafter; therefore let this suffice for the present. Behold I am Alpha and Omega. Amen."

This quotation shows us how restive Emma Smith, Joseph's first and lawful wife, was under polygamy. The threats of destruction which were intended to subdue her, betray also the nervous uneasiness of the polygamous prophet. The incongruous plea that Emma shall forgive the trespasses of Joseph against her, betrays the prophet's own sense of the immorality of his polygamous relations. But, cheat, liar, fraud, libertine, coward as he was, he naturally invoked the authority of the God whom he dishonored with his every breath, in reducing the wife he ought to have protected, to the intolerable ignominy of polygamy.

This is not only anti-Christian; it is in the teeth of the teaching of natural religion. Go to Utah. Visit the homes of Polygamy. In this yard is a row of small houses, much alike, three or four, half a dozen, or a dozen or more of them, each inhabited by a polygamous wife of the same man. In an adjacent yard is a single house with a number of rooms, in every room save one, the parlor, a wife and her

children, all belonging to one man. In still another yard is a cabin with one room in which a man lives with a plurality of wives. See the prevalent look of hopelessness on the women's faces, save in the cases of new-comers, temporary queens of the harems, a few fanatics, and hardened wretches. See in this land of boasted freedom these slaves. See in this vaunted civilization this sign of blackest savagery.

Ye men who hear me as well as ye women: is not this against the demands of your highest nature? Is not conjugal love exclusive in its demands? Is it not exclusive in proportion to a man's elevation of character? Don't you count that man close akin to a beast who would be willing to live in relations of polyandry? Does not logic compel you to take a similar view of woman and polygamy? Can you think of yourself with any degree of moral complacency as living in polygamy? There is not a man here who will dare say it openly!

The Bible condemns it. The original institutions of marriage, of which we have record in Genesis 2:24, is strictly and only monogamous. Moses restricted polygamy. Malachi rebuked it. Christ roundly condemned it, and re-established the monogamous character of marriage. His inspired apostles set a stigma of disapproval on polygamy by forbidding that any polygamous man should be allowed to hold office in the church.

Joseph Smith did not get his revelation sanctioning polygamy from Jesus Christ, who is the same yesterday, to-day and forever.

The Mormon distinction between murder and the shedding of innocent blood, was in the words of Mrs. Stenhouse as follows: "Shedding innocent blood is the crime of killing a saint, which can never be forgiven but by the death of the transgressor; but the spilling of a Gentile's blood is

of quite a different character. To murder a Gentile may sometimes be inexpedient, or perhaps even to a certain extent a wrong, but it is seldom if ever, a crime, and never an unpardonable sin."

Scores and hundreds of inoffensive immigrants passing through Utah were cut down by the agents of the Mormon church. In 1857, one hundred and twenty-one persons—men, women and children—belonging to an immigrant train peaceably making its way through the country, were brutally put to death in what is known as the Mountain Meadow's massacre. This wholesale murder was under the field leadership of Bishop John Doyle Lee, and was instigated and approved by the highest Mormon authorities, including Brigham Young. Lee, according to his published confessions, believed the murder fully justified, because commanded by Mormon authorities above him.\*

The doctrine of the Blood Atonement is, to quote Mrs. Stenhouse again, "that the murder of an apostate is a deed of love! If a saint sees another leave the church, or even if he only believes that his brother's faith is weakening and he will apostatize before long, he knows that the soul of his unbelieving brother will be lost if he dies in such a state, and that only by his blood's being shed is there any chance for forgiveness for him; it is therefore the kindest action that he can perform toward him to shed his blood—the doing so is a deed of truest love. The nearer, the dearer, the more tenderly loved the sinner is, the greater the affection shown by the shedders of blood. The action is no longer murder or the shedding of innocent blood, for the taint of apostasy takes away its innocence—it is making atonement, not a crime; it is an act of mercy, therefore meritorious."\*

Brigham Young said in one of his sermons in the Salt

---

\*The Mormon Menace, or The Confessions of John Doyle Lee, pp. 298ff.

\*Mrs. T. B. H. Stenhouse: "Tell It All," p. 312.

Lake City Tabernacle, "I have known a great many men who have left this church for whom there is no chance whatever of exaltation, but if their blood had been spilled it would have been better for them.

"The wickedness and ignorance of the nations forbid this principle's being in full force. But the time will come when the law of God will be in full force. This is loving our neighbor as ourselves. If he needs help, help him; if he wants salvation, and it is necessary to spill his blood on the earth in order that he may be saved, spill it.

"Now, brethren and sisters, will you live your religion? How many hundreds of times have I asked that question? Will the Latter Day Saints live their religion?"†

On other occasions he said: "I could refer to plenty of instances where men have been righteously slain in order to atone for their sins.

"Now, when you hear my brethren telling about cutting people off from the earth, that, you consider, is strong doctrine; but it is to save them, not to destroy them."‡

It is to be remarked that one can commit apostasy simply by crossing the will of a living member of the Mormon priesthood. Accordingly "Rosmos Anderson, who wanted to marry his step-daughter against the wishes of the ward bishop, had his throat cut by the ecclesiastical executioners, so that his blood might run into his freshly dug grave."\* John Doyle Lee says† that this ward Bishop, Klingensmith, wishing to marry the girl himself, was one of Anderson's executioners; but that the killing was a religious duty and a just act.

The inculcation of those principles and the example of Mormon elders explain in considerable part the peculiarly long list of murders and other horrors in the history of Utah.

Our Lord Jesus forbade the use of force of any kind in

---

†Quoted in "Tell It All," p. 318.

‡John Doyle Lee: *The Mormon Menace*, p. 257.

\**International Encyclopedia*, Sub Mormons.

‡†*The Mormon Menace*, pp. 292ff.

religion. It has been a law of God for the State from the time of Noah: "Who sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed." But the Mormon law makes a Mormon's murder of a Gentile no crime and teaches the slaughter of a Mormon on the point of apostalizing a virtuous act. Nothing more diabolical can be found in the moral teachings of any people than these principles of Mormon ethics.

Such is the Mormon theology and ethics. They claim that they are a development of Christianity. But what concord hath Christ with Belial? Mormonism is not of the Old Testament nor the New. It treats of a different God, of a different salvation, accomplished by different means, of different ideals of life and duty. While Christianity is from heaven and bears writ all over it, its celestial character, Mormonism is the monstrous offspring of earth and hell.

It is a huge monster that would roll back civilization thousands of years and grind the weaker sex as degraded orientals, or brutal and naked savages, do. It would re-establish in our Western world, blessed of high heaven with independence of Church and State, that adulterous communion from which comes the motley brood, Intolerance, Priestcraft and Persecution unto death.

Mormonism aims to control this nation in its politics as it tries to control Utah.

We are told that in the State of Utah no Mormon can be a candidate for office of any kind save one authorized by the President of the Church, and that he will authorize no one but an actual and avowed polygamist; that no bill can pass the legislature save by the consent of the Mormon Church; that all objectionable bills are strangled in the committee rooms; that the church has a committee to devise and supervise all legislation; that their approval means passage and their disapproval failure; that all schools are in the hands of Mormons, even the State University and the Agri-

cultural School, which is largely supported by the aid of the National Government; and that all of these are branches of the Mormon propaganda.\* If this be regarded as an over-statement of their power in Utah, it may nevertheless be taken as a just exhibition of their aim.

Mormonism would turn right into wrong and wrong into right. It would deprive us of that God who is glorious in holiness, fearful in praises, doing wonders; and give us instead its gods with ethical ideals lower than Jesuitism ever reached in its lowest grovelings.

We have called this monster huge. It has grown great and is still growing. It has met obstacles many. Its wanderings from 1831 to 1847 are matters of familiar history. Hundreds of Mormons have perished at the hands of their incensed neighbors. Elder Richards, speaking from the point of view of a Latter Day Saint, said about a score of years ago: "Persecution raged against the church from the beginning. All kinds of misrepresentation were resorted to by its enemies. The Saints were driven from their possessions in Missouri and afterwards in Illinois; many of them were slaughtered by mobs, their property was confiscated, and in 1844, on June 27th, the Prophet Joseph Smith and his brother Hiram were shot to death by Mobocrats with blackened faces, at Carthage, Illinois. Subsequently the body of the Saints were driven from Nauvoo, which they had built on the banks of the Mississippi, and under the leadership of Brigham Young, who was the President of the Twelve Apostles, the persecuted Saints made their way to winter quarters, on the banks of the Missouri, near where Council Bluff now stands. . . . In 1847 the famous journey from the Missouri river across the plains and mountains was accomplished by Brigham Young and the pioneers, numbering one hundred and forty-three men,

---

\*R. W. Jopling's Report of Dr. Sheldon Jackson's Address.



three women and two children. They reached the spot where Salt Lake City now stands, July 24th of that year. The great temple, costing more than three million dollars, rear its towers on the spot where Brigham Young declared at that time: 'Here we will build the temple of our God.'

"The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints has now its branches in all the civilized nations and upon many islands of the sea. It has sixteen hundred elders in the mission field, laboring without pay. Its membership numbers about three hundred thousand. It has four magnificent temples in which are administered ordinances for the living and the dead. It is presided over by Lorenzo Snow, George S. Cannon and Joseph F. Smith, Apostles of Jesus Christ, holding the keys of the kingdom of heaven, with the binding and loosing power which Christ conferred on Peter, James and John, and which they restored to earth. It has twelve Apostles to open the door of the kingdom in all nations, and set in order the affairs of the church. It has all the orders of the Christian ministry and priesthood which were in the church during the first century of the Christian era. It administers the same ordinances and enjoys the same unity, power, spiritual gifts and divine communications as were then bestowed."\* Thus spoke Elder Richards, telling the truth, too, so far as his account is concerned with the progress of Mormonism and the surmounting of difficulties, the growth and spread of the sect, the zeal of its representatives, and its spirit of propagandism; but misrepresenting anew the relation of the Mormonism to Christianity. This Mormon Church is no more like the Christian Church of the first century than that arch-rebel who was cast from the heavenly heights to the infernal depths, is like those pure spirits that kept their first estate and

---

\*In Progress. Vol. III. No. 11, p. 684.

minister about God's throne this hour. This church has continued to grow during the last twenty years.

The growth of Mormonism is probably to be explained: 1st.—By its religious earnestness. Some mormons are earnest to spread their tenets because of the temporal gain they will thus get. Some have been given over to a strong delusion, to believe a lie, the lie they teach; because they wished to believe it instead of God's truth and to serve gods of their own instead of the true God. Some are honest fanatics, deceived and deceiving. This earnestness is a powerful factor in their growth.

2d.—They are organized compactly and are under the direction of one all powerful will. Officers abound. Every officer has absolute control over all beneath him. At the head stands the President, who is the Prophet, Revelator and Seer. Near him stand his advisers, who can advise only. Next comes the College of Apostles; next the seventy. These are the general officers. Each district has its subordinate organization.

Everywhere official promotion is the certain result of efficiency in office already held. Scores of men are appointed to go out and serve as missionaries, says Bishop Tuttle, every year; and they go usually without purse or scrip, save such as they themselves provide. There are perhaps two thousand such missionaries in the field to-day. This compact organization helps it to grow.

3rd.—Polygamy welds the Mormons together in a solid unity, inasmuch as it separates between the Mormons and the rest of the world; and inasmuch as having permeated Mormon society it cannot be condemned without disgrace either in one's self or kinsfolk. The very women who hate it, know that its overthrow will affect themselves and their daughters with dishonor.

Hence, while they published to the world that they had

ceased to contract polygamous marriages since Utah was made a State, they still did make them, if outside witnesses can be trusted. "The Missionaries of the Northern Presbyterian Church, in the year 1898, found 2,000 polygamous marriages that had been celebrated since Statehood was conferred, and over 1,000 children born of these marriages." And these children are having Mormonism instilled into them from their earliest years. Thus Mormonism grows. It claimed 65,000 additions in the year 1898. The pronouncement against future polygamy by President Smith in the Annual Conference of 1904, cannot be taken as *bona fide*, except with salt.

This growing monster, for a time fed chiefly on the peasantry of Europe, but alas! it is now preying on our own land. Nor is it confining itself to the more out of the way places and the homes of the illiterate and morally untrained. It has become bolder. It commands newspapers in prominent cities. It held a convention in the later nineties in Atlanta, Georgia. A leading newspaper gave a broadside to it, and no condemnation. The following cut is reproduced from *The Sun, Baltimore*, Wednesday Morning, February 8, 1911.

From the Presbyterian of the South, of July 18, 1918, we cite:

"After openly defying and after persistently defending his own violation of the anti-polygamy statutes of the Federal government by marrying three women and after being excluded from the House of Representatives, Brigham H. Roberts, a Mormon, is now a khaki-clad government official to serve as chaplain in our army."

These are but instances of the aggressions of Mormonism. The people of the country should be aroused to the danger of such.

If the people were properly instructed in God's truth comparatively few of them could be led off. But now vast num-



bers about us are as sheep having no shepherd. They are the prey of wolves. We ought to teach God's truth and so fill men's mind with it as to fortify them against such anti-Christian religions, and we ought to expose Mormonism, and we ought to pray to God to bring this pestiferous religion to naught, at once. What are you going to do about it, my brethren? Carry this question with you. A part of the responsibility for the future evil of Mormonism rests on you. God help you to meet it! Amen.

## Christian Science

---

I have endeavored in the following lectures to present as a *preliminary*, Mrs. Eddy's definition of her ism, her allegations as to its sources, characteristics, and proofs, and then to give a systematic view of her teachings on ontology, theology, anthropology, soteriology, eschatology, and healing.

I claim only very imperfect success, owing largely to the impossibility of throwing into system drivellings so heterogeneous and inconsistent as Mrs. Eddy's are.

I crave, therefore, the indulgence of the hearer as I proceed, and particularly while I shall be dealing with the preliminaries and with her ontology.

## Literature on Christian Science

---

1. *Science and Health.*
2. *Autobiography.*
3. *Manual of the First Church of Christ, Scientist.*
4. *Miscellaneous Writings.* (All the foregoing are by Mrs. Eddy.)
5. *W. P. McCorkle: Christian Science a False Christ*
6. *Marsten: The Mask of Christian Science.*
7. *Bates: Christian Science and Its Problems.*
8. *M. Twain: Christian Science.*
9. *Mrs. Eddy: Message to the Mother Church, June, 1902.*

# Christian Science

---

Christian Science is the name given by Mrs. Mary Mason Baker Glover Patterson Eddy, to her teaching.

*I. In the study of her teaching we shall let the authoress (1) define her caption of it, (2) tell how she got the matter of it, (3) describe its character, (4) set forth her "tests" of its truth:*

(1) *Of the term Christian Science, she says:*

"The terms Divine Science, Spiritual Science, Christ Science, or Christian Science, or Science alone, she (Mrs. Eddy), employs interchangeably, according to the requirements of the context. These synonymous terms stand for everything relating to God, the infinite, supreme, eternal mind. It may be said, however, that the term Christian Science relates especially to this science as applied to humanity. It reveals God not as the author of sin, sickness and death, but as divine Principle, supreme Being, Mind, exempt from all evil. It teaches that matter is the falsity, not the fact, of existence; that nerves, brain, stomach, lungs, and so forth, have—as matter—no intelligence, life or sensation," (pp. 20-21).\*

She says, more briefly, "The term Christian Science was introduced by the author to designate the scientific system of Metaphysical healing," (p. 17).

She says again, "The chief stones in the temples of Christian Science are to be found in the following postulates; that life is God, Good and not evil; that Soul is sinless not to be found in body; that Spirit is not, and cannot be, material; that life is not subject to death; that the real man

---

\*The reference to pages in this lecture are to the pages of "Science and Health," unless otherwise specified.



has no consciousness of material life or death," (p. 184).

(2) As to the origin of her ism the authoress says:

"The revelation consists of two parts:

1. The discovery of this Divine Science of Mind-healing, through a spiritual sense of the Scriptures, and through the teachings of the Comforter, as promised by the Master.

2. The proof, by present demonstration, that the so-called miracles of Jesus did not specially belong to a dispensation now ended, but that they illustrate an ever-operative divine Principle. The operation of this principle indicates forever the Scientific order and continuity (p. 17).

"I therefore plant myself unreservedly on the teachings of Jesus, of his Apostles, of the Prophets, and on the testimony of the Science of mind. Other foundations there are none. All other systems—systems based wholly or partly on knowledge gained through the material senses—are reeds shaken by the wind, not houses built on the rock.

"The theories I combat are these: (1) That all is matter; (2) that matter originates in Mind, and is real as Mind, possessing intelligence and life. The first theory, that matter is everything, is quite as reasonable as the second, that Mind and matter co-exist and co-operate. One only of the following statements can be true: (1) that everything is matter; (2) that everything is Mind. Which one is it?

"Matter and mind are antagonistic, and both have not place and power. Only by understanding that there is but one power—not two powers, matter and mind—are correct and logical conclusions reached" (pp. 165-166).

"To grasp the reality and order of Being in its Science, you must begin by reckoning God, Good, as the only Mind, Life, Substance, Intelligence" (p. 171).

These quotations show that Mrs. Eddy claims to get her teachings "through a spiritual sense of the Scriptures, and through the teachings of the Comforter"—claims to get it

out of "the teachings of Jesus, of his Apostles, of the Prophets" and out of "the testimony of the Sciences of Mind." She identifies "the teachings of the Comforter" with "the testimony of the Science of Mind," *i. e.*, with her own inspired teachings. (See p. 227).

What she represents as "the spiritual sense of the Scriptures" is arbitrarily read by her into the Scriptures. They contain no such sense as she asserts that they contain. Read her "Key to the Scriptures," pp. 495-590, made up of comments on parts of the first four chapters of Genesis and a smaller portion of the Book of Revelation, and of a "Glossary," in which she defines the senses in which she claims to use certain terms. The character of her "exegesis" is fairly illustrated by the following examples which have been selected almost at random from the "Key," wherein she tells us that "each text is followed by its spiritual interpretation."

"Genesis 1:2: And the earth was without form, and void; and darkness was upon the face of the deep, and the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters."

"The divine Principles and idea constitute spiritual harmony—Heaven and eternity. In this universe of Truth, matter is unknown. No supposition of error enters there. Christian Science, the Word of God, saith to the darkness upon the face of error, "God is All-in-all," and light appears in proportion as this is understood. It reveals the eternal wonder—that infinite space is peopled with God's ideas, reflecting Him in countless spiritual forms" (p. 497).

"Genesis 1:6: 'And God said: Let there be a firmament in the midst of the waters, and let it divide the waters from the waters.'

"Understanding is the spiritual firmament, whereby human conception distinguishes between Truth and error. The divine Mind, not matter, creates all identities; and they are

forms of thought, the ideas of Spirit, present to Mind only, never to mindless matter" (pp. 498-499).

"Genesis 1:24: And God said: 'Let the earth bring forth the living creature after his kind—cattle and creeping thing and beast of the earth, after his kind;' and it was so."

"Spirit diversifies, classifies, and individualizes all thoughts, which are as eternal as the mind conceiving them; but the intelligence, existence, and continuity of each thought remain in God the divinely creative Principle thereof" (pp. 506-507).

"Genesis 1:25: And God created the beast of the earth after his kind, and cattle after their kind, and everything that creepeth on the earth after his kind; and God saw that it was good."

"God inspires all forms of spiritual thought. His thoughts are spiritual realities. Mortal mind—being non-existent, and consequently outside the range of interminable space—could not, by simulating deific power, invent the divine thoughts, and afterwards recreate them on its own plane; since nothing exists beyond the reach of all inclusive infinity, wherein and whereof God is the sole creator. He dwells in the realm of Mind, joyous in strength. His infinite ideas run and disport themselves. In humility they climb the heights of holiness. \* \* \*

"Patience is symbolized by the tireless worm, creeping slowly over lofty summits, persevering always in its intent. The serpent of God's creating is neither subtle nor poisonous, but a wise idea, charming in its adroitness; for love has no elements of evil or poison to impart. Its ideas are subject to the mind which formed them" (pp. 507-508).

On these interpretations I remark:

The sagest and the simplest should see that the Mother of Christian Science put into the first chapter of Genesis

these vaporings. That chapter, in the first twenty-five verses, gives a sublime account of the order of the creation of the material world. But Mrs. Eddy, as has already cropped out, teaches that there is no material world. Hence she has deliberately set to work to break the force of the narrative in Genesis I, by injecting teachings directly contradictory to its real contents. In doing so, she betrays both conscious imposture and insane egotism. She must have known, if she had common sense, that Genesis I taught the reality of matter and its creation, and not the vaporings which she proclaims; must have been guilty of conscious imposture. At the same time only insane egotism could have moved her to attempt this *eisgesis* for exegesis.

She is guilty of the same sort of doddering in dealing with Genesis 2. Take, for example,

“Genesis, 2:6: But there went up a mist from the earth, and watered the whole face of the ground.”

The following is her spiritual comment on this passage:

“The Science and Truth of the divine creation have been presented in the verses already considered; and now the opposite error, a material view of creation, is to be set forth. The second chapter of Genesis contains a statement of this material view of God and the universe, which is the exact opposite of Scientific Truth. The history of error, or matter, if veritable, would set aside the omnipotence of Spirit; but it is the false history, in contradistinction to the true.

“The Science of the first record proves the incorrectness of the second, for they are antagonistic. The first record assigns all might and government to God, and endows man out of His perfection and power. The second record chronicles man as mutable and mortal—as having broken away from deity, and as revolving in an orbit of his own. Existence, separate from Divinity, Science regards as impossible.

"This second record unmistakably gives the history of error in its externalized forms, called life and intelligence in matter. It records Pantheism, as opposed to the supremacy of divine Spirit."

The hearer has already noted how this old dame misconceives, or at the least, misstates the orthodox teaching which she opposes. She is not more unfair in characterizing the orthodox view of the universe as Pantheistic in the comment than her general treatment of orthodoxy.

"Genesis 2:7: And the Lord God (Jehovah) formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living soul."

"Did the divine and infinite principle become a finite deity, that He should now be called Jehovah? Mind has man made both male and female, with a single command: How then can a material organization become the basis of man? How can the non-existent become the medium of mind, and error be the enunciator of Truth? Matter is not the reflection of Spirit, yet God is reflected in all His creation. Is this addition to his creation real or unreal? Is it the truth, or is it a lie, concerning man and God?"

"It must be the latter, for God presently curses the ground. Could Spirit evolve its opposite, matter—and give matter ability to sin and suffer? Is Spirit, God, injected into dust, and eventually ejected at the demand of matter? Does Spirit enter dust, and lose therein the divine nature and omnipotence? Does mind, God, enter matter, to become there a mortal sinner, animated by the breath of God? (pp. 517-518).

"Genesis 3:16: Unto the woman he said: I will multiply thy sorrow and thy conception; in sorrow shalt thou bring forth thy children and thy desire shall be to thy husband, and he shall rule over thee."

"Divine Science deals its chief blow at the supposed ma

terial foundations of life and intelligence. It dooms idolatry. A belief in other gods, other creatures, and other creations, must go down before Christian Science. It unveils the results of sin, as shown in sickness and death. When will man pass through the open gate of Christian Science, into the Heaven of Soul, the heritage of the first born among men? 'Truth is indeed the way' (p. 527).

If old Mother Eddy can get these vaporings out of these verses, or, on an occasion of reading them, she could as easily get them every one out of "Mary had a little lamb." She says, indeed: "The Divine Science taught in the original language of the Bible came through inspiration, and needs inspiration to be understood, p. 215. That is, she would close the mouths of her followers when they are tempted to recalcitrate against the imposture of her "interpretations," by the claim that she speaks the mind of God. But the claim of inspiration on her part is insufficient, God could not stultify himself by teaching that in the sublime account of the creation of the material universe he meant to teach that no such thing as matter exists. If the Scriptures yield Christian Science, only as she interprets them, it is plain that they are not a source of it at all. Only an impostor and a cheat could pretend that they teach any such stuff as she teaches. As a matter of fact, they contradict every distinctive feature of Christian Science.

Her dodderings about Gen. 2:7 show that she hates the Bible and especially those parts more plainly against such dodderings.

Another pretended source is the "teachings of the Comforter," "the testimony of the Science of Mind," her own "understanding of mind." Her own understanding of mind is claimed to be source of all in her teaching which is not found in the Scriptures.

But it has been charged and ably maintained, that she de-

rived the essential points of her theory of mental healing and even the term "Christian Science," from Dr. Phineas P. Quimby, of Portland, Maine. The charge seems to be proven by conclusive testimony. See the *Arena* for May, 1899, also W. P. McCorkle, *Christian Science, a False Christ*, pp. 43-45.

It is charged and made equally probable that she borrowed the theosophical and Pantheistical element which her teaching contains, as will be shown, notwithstanding her denials, from Oriental and ancient Gnostic sources; that her teaching in this sphere is singularly like Madam Blavatsky's, in regard both to matter and phraseology; that their definitions of God, their doctrines of creation, and of man, their doctrines of grace, and of the future life, their discounts of the material senses, are all singularly alike; that in all these particulars they have adopted the doctrinal system of the ancient Gnostics. Says Dr. Wm. P. McCorkle:

"Mrs. Eddy teaches them, if anything, more definitely than does Madame Blavatsky; but the latter does not hesitate to claim kinship with Gnostics in general and with Simon Magus in particular, identifying her system with theirs." *Christian Science, a False Christ*, p. 265. See also "*An Old Enemy With Two New Faces*," in the *Presbyterian Quarterly*, April, 1899.

It is pretty clear that her understanding of the divine Mind is only through Oriental Pantheists and ancient Gnostics.

She contends that her cures are the sufficient proof of the correctness of her teachings; but a thoughtful man can see in her cures no greater proofs of the correctness of her teachings than that Francis Schlatter spoke by inspiration because many praised him for having released them from the thralldom of disease, or than that the Negro woman in New York, who worked wonders with "grease taken from the

tail of a black cat that had died with its throat cut," was inspired to teach men the way of life. Her well-attested cures were such as have been wrought over and over again by people who believed and taught the contradictories of her theories.

(3) She describes the character of her teaching further by declaring: "In Christian Science are no discords, or contradictions, because its logic is as harmonious as the reasoning of an accurately stated syllogism, or a properly computed sum in arithmetic," (p. 22). She describes it further (in which perhaps her lust for gain speaks out), as follows:

"A Christian Scientist requires my work on *Science and Health* for his text-book, and so do all his students and patients. Why? *First*, because it is the voice of Truth to this age, and contains the whole of Christian Science, or the Science of healing through Mind. *Second*, because it was the first published book containing a statement of Christian Science, gave the first rules for demonstrating this Science, and registered this revealed Truth, uncontaminated with human hypotheses. Other works which have borrowed from this book without giving it credit, have adulterated the Science. *Third*, because this work has done more for teacher and student, for healer and patients, than has been accomplished by other works" (p. 453).

We have already seen that the distinctive teachings of her book appear to have been stolen from Quimby, from Oriental theosophists and ancient Gnostics; and that she endeavored to support these teachings by imposed "spiritual senses" on certain Scriptures, notwithstanding the patent fact that these very Scriptures cut the ground from beneath her teaching.

As to the logical character of her teaching, it would be hard, in all the range of literature, to find more inconse-



quent writing, and more numerous fallacies considering the size of her book, than are to be found in "*Science and Health*." Take this as a fair instance of the logical character of her writing:

"Mind creates its own likeness in ideas, and the substance of an idea is very far from being the supposed substance of non-intelligent matter. Hence the Father of Mind is not the Father of Matter," p. 153; or again,

"The mortality of Matter establishes the conclusion that matter never originates, never did originate, in the immortal \* \* \* Matter is therefore not created by Mind, or for the manifestations and support of mind" (p. 175).

This prophetess is often guilty of the fallacy known as the logical quadruped. That Mrs. Eddy is not only guilty of formal fallacies but reasons from false premises as well, will appear still more clearly as we proceed.

(4) She talks much of the tests, or proof, of Faith, *i. e.*, of Christian Science. She says, "These proofs consist solely in the destruction of sin, sickness, and death, by the power of the Spirit, as Jesus destroyed them," pp. 128-129; "The proof that the system herein stated is Christianly Scientific resides in the good it accomplishes; for it cures on a demonstrable principle which all may understand," pp. 538-539. She apparently sets forth another criterion of Truth, on p. 22, "If you wish to know the spiritual fact, you can discover it by reversing the material testimony, be it pro or con—be it in accord with your preconceptions, or utterly contrary thereto."

Mark Twain well says of the book, *Science and Health*: "Without ever presenting anything which may rightfully be called by the strong name of Evidence, and sometimes without even *mentioning* a reason for a deduction at all, it thunders out the startling words: "I have proved" so and so. It takes the Pope and all the great guns of his Church

in battery assembled to authoritatively settle and establish the meaning of a sole and single unclarified passage of Scriptures, and this at vast cost of time and study and reflection, but the author of this work is superior to all that. She finds the whole Bible in an unclarified condition, and at small expense of time and no expense of mental effort she clarifies it from lid to lid, recognizes and improves the meanings, then authoritatively settles and establishes them with formulas which you cannot tell from "Let there be light!" "Here you have it." It is the first time since the dawn-days of Creation that a Voice has gone crashing through space with such placid and complacent confidence and command." Mark Twain, *Christian Science*, pp. 30-32.

We have seen that *her cures* are no sign that she speaks the truth; and it will require more than her *ipse dixit* to do away with the validity of the testimony of our senses, since we must trust them, to receive her teaching, through written or spoken word.

II. *In the further study of her teaching let us consider her "Ontology," or "Metaphysics."*

She says: "Ontology receives less attention than physiology. Why? Because mortal mind must waken to spiritual life, before it cares to solve the problem of Being," p. 548. "Ontology is defined as 'the science of the necessary constituents and relations of all beings,' and it underlies all metaphysical practice. Our system of Mind-healing rests on the apprehension of the nature and essence of all Being—on mind and its essential qualities," p. 456. "Metaphysics is above physics and matter does not enter into metaphysical premises or conclusions. Its categories rest on one basis, namely, the divine Mind. Metaphysics resolves things into thoughts, and exchanges the objects of sense for the ideas of soul. . . . Matter and Mind

are antagonistic, and both have not place or power. Only by understanding that there is but one power—not two powers, matter and Mind—are correct and logical conclusions reached” pp. 165-166. “All forms of error support the false conclusions that there is more than one life; that material history is as real and living as spiritual history; that mortal error is as conclusively mental as immortal Truth; and that there are two separate, antagonistic entities and beings; two powers—namely, Spirit and matter—resulting in a third person (mortal man), who carries out the delusions of sin, sickness and death.” “Such theories are evidently erroneous,” p. 100. “All real Being is in the divine Mind and idea;” a “false sense evolves, in belief, a subjective state of mortal mind, which this same mind calls matter. . . . Mind is all, and matter is naught. . . . the only realities are the divine Mind and Idea,” which idea she holds to be man, p. 23.

The heart of her ontological teaching comes out in her doctrine of God. She says, “The starting-point of Science is that God, Spirit is supreme, and that there is no other might or Mind—that God is love, and therefore He is divine Principle” (p. 171). “God is supreme Being, the only life, substance, and soul, the only Intelligence of the universe, including man” (p. 225). “God is what the Scriptures declare Him to be—Life, Truth, Love. God is Spirit and Spirit is divine Principle. Principle is divine Mind, and Mind is not both good and bad, for God is mind; therefore Mind is God only, and there is but one mind, because there is but one God,” (p. 226). “Man was and is God’s idea, even the infinite expression of the infinite Mind, and coexistent and coeternal with that Mind. Man has been forever in the eternal Mind, God; but infinite mind can never be in man, though made manifest through him. Man’s consciousness and individuality are reflections of God. They

are emanations of Him who is Life, Truth, Love. Idea was and is never material, but always spiritual and eternal" (p. 231). "God and man, Principle and idea, are inseparable, harmonious and eternal" (p. 232). "All is infinite Mind and its infinite manifestation, for God is All-in-all. Spirit is immortal truth; matter is mortal error. Spirit is the real and eternal; matter is the unreal and temporal. Spirit is God, and man is his image and likeness; hence man is spiritual and not material. . . . "The spiritual universe, including man, is a compound yet individual idea, reflecting the divine Substance of Spirit (p. 464). "God is the Principle of man and man is the idea of God" (p. 472). "Soul (God) is the Substance, Life and Intelligence of man. . . . Man is the expression of God, Soul. . . . Separated from man, who expresses Soul, Spirit would be a non-entity. Man divorced from Spirit, would lose his entity; but there is, there can be, no such division, for man is so-existent with God, and God is Spirit (p. 473).

Remark:

1st. These quotations show that she held an idealism like Berkeley's, in that she denied the existence of matter, but unlike Berkeley's in that while he affirmed that material nature, in its ultimate analysis, is but a conscious experience—produced in the creature by the activity of God, she held that material nature is the creature of "Mortal Mind," which itself is an unreality as truly as its creation.

2d. These quotations also show, notwithstanding her disclaimers, that she was a Pantheist. They teach over and over again that God is the only mind—the only life, substance, soul. They teach that God is the substance, life, intelligence, Principle of man.

These and scores of other passages leave one in doubt as to whether God Himself was in her view more than Thought—as to whether she did not resolve God Himself into idea.

Certainly she seems often to make no distinction between substance and attribute, but to identify every attribute with every other, and each with substance. She avows at times that she resolves things into thoughts. Compare what she calls a definition of God, on p. 9. "God=Principle, Life, Truth, Love, Soul, Spirit, Mind." She is not always consistent, but speaks sometimes as if she held to absolute Pantheistic Idealism.

These quotations show that creation by God was turned into emanation from God, by her, another ear-mark of the Pantheist. (See pp. 50 and 51 of this lecture).

They teach that, separated from man, God would be a non-entity; that He and man, His universe, are necessarily co-eternal.

These quotations show that God had no personality in Mrs. Eddy's conception; that he was only Truth, Love, Intelligence, Spirit, Principle. She more clearly teaches the same view, when she declares, that God is identical with nature. . . . that God is natural Good (p. 13); when she stigmatizes the orthodox idea of God as personal, as "anthropomorphism, or humanization of Deity" (p. 510); and when she contrasts "interpreting God as a corporeal Savior" (a misrepresentation of the orthodox view), and as "the saving Principle" (p. 181).

She betrays her Pantheism in another way:

In addition to that which has been incidentally brought out as to her views of man's being, she teaches: "Man is neither young nor old. He has neither birth nor death. He is not a beast, a vegetable, or a migratory mind. He does not pass from the mortal to the immortal, from evil to good, or from good to evil" (p. 140). "When God expressed in man the infinite idea, forever developing itself, broadening and rising higher and higher from a boundless basis, He created everything that is to be found in the

Kingdom of Mind. We know no more of man's individuality, as the true divine image and likeness, than we know of God's" (p. 154). Men "represents the sum of all substance or infinite Mind" (p. 155). "Rightly understood, instead of possessing a sentient material form, man has a sensationless body, and God, the Soul of man and of existence, is perpetual in His own individuality, harmony and immortality, thus perpetuating these qualities in man" (p. 176). "Man is spiritual. He is not God, Spirit. If man were Spirit, then men would be spirits, gods" (p. 259). "God is the principle of Man; and the Principle of man rendering perfect its idea, or reflection—man—remains perfect. Man is the expression of God's being. If there was ever a moment when man expressed not this perfection, he could not have expressed God; and there would have been a time when Deity was without entity, Being. If man has lost perfection, he has lost his Principle, or Mind. If man ever existed without Principle, or Mind, then his existence was a myth" (p. 466). "Man is the idea of divine Principle, not physique. He is the compound idea of God, including all right ideas; the generic term for all that reflects God's image and likeness; the conscious identity of Being, as found in Science, where man is the reflection of God or Mind, and therefore is eternal; that which has no separate mind from God; that which has not a single quality underived from Deity; that which possesses no life, intelligence, or creative power of his own, but reflects all that belongs to his Maker. . . . Man is incapable of sin, sickness and death, inasmuch as he derives his essence from God, and possesses not a single original, or underived power" (p. 471). "Man is the infinite idea of infinite Spirit" (p. 582).

From these and scores of similar passages, it is clear, again, that Mrs. Eddy is a Pantheist. If she represents in one breath, man as God's eternal idea, not God Himself, in the

next she teaches that man has no separate mind from God; that man's intelligence is God's intelligence; that in man resides the "conscious identity of being," that is, that the only consciousness which God has of His own identity is the consciousness which man has. True she sometimes contradicts herself roundly, as when she says: "God is the Only Life, and Life is no more in the forms which express it than substance is in the shadow" (p. 226); or when she says again? "Man reflects and expresses the divine Substance or Mind; but God is not in his reflection any more than man is in the mirror which reflects his image," (pp. 196-197). She even tells us why she denies the immanence of God in man: that, "if He dwelt within what He creates, God would not be reflected, but absorbed," and so forth (p. 226). She contradicts herself but what are contradictions to this prophetess? Her insane egotism makes her regardless of the eternal laws of thought. She speaks and expects human sheep to bleat an amen.

3d. From the passages quoted, and more like them, she teaches the impersonality of man: "He is the infinite idea of the infinite God." If a person at all, since he is an infinite idea, he would be an infinite person, and God being infinite, we would have two infinite persons. But we have already seen that Mrs. Eddy rejects the notion of personality as applied to God as *anthropomorphic*. Of man she is willing to predicate a sort of individuality but no personality.

From this point of view it is hard to understand her fear of anthropomorphism, should she predicate the personality of God. Man she denies to be personal.

She teaches that man was never created, never fell, never recovered to communion with God, is eternal, sinless, perfect, non-personal, unaccountable. In making each of these predications, she would force us to deny the teachings of Scripture, uninspired history, personal experience, or con-

sciousness, and sometimes all of them. Thus she asserts man's sinlessness, which is contradicted by the teachings of Scripture, history, consciousness and conscience.

4th. (Passing now to her ontology of the unreal):

"On these questions of ontology, *Mortal mind* hath wrought vast confusion, "according to Mrs. Eddy. She tells us: "The term *mortal mind* is a solecism in language; and involves an improper use of the word *mind*. As mind is immortal, the phrase *mortal mind* implies something untrue and therefore unreal; and as the phrase is used in teaching Christian Science, it is meant to designate something which has no real existence" (p. 8): "Mortal mind and body are one. Neither exists without the other. . . . Mortal matter, or body, is but a false concept of mortal mind. It (mortal mind) builds its own superstructure, of which the material body is the grosser and more basal portion; but from first to last this body is only a material and sensuous belief" (p. 70). "The fading forms of matter, the mortal body and earth are the fleeting thoughts of the human mind" (p. 160).

Truly mortal mind is a strange sort of thing—identical with body, which is its own false concept, self-evolving, having in the body its grosser and more basal portion, this body being only a material and sensuous belief!

This unreal thing—unlike anything, I freely grant, in the whole realm of substantive, or factual existence—is responsible, according to the much married prophetess for a vast number of things which people of common-sense regard as realities, which she considers as utter unrealities.

She makes mortal mind responsible for Adam and everything which has sprung from him. Hear some of her sage statements: "The word Adam is from the Hebrew *Adamah*, signifying the *red color of the ground, dust, nothingness*. Divide the name Adam into two syllables, and it reads a



dam, or obstruction. This suggests the thought of something fluid, of mortal mind in solution, of the darkness which seemed to appear, when 'darkness was upon the face of the deep,' and matter stood as opposed to Spirit, as that which is accursed; and from this earth, or matter, sprang Adam" (p. 233). "Adam, the synonym for error, stands for a belief of material mind. He begins his reign over man somewhat mildly, but increases in falsehood as his days become shorter" (p. 522).

5th. Not only does mortal, or material mind produce matter and Adam, Mrs. Eddy claims that it has been "Scientifically established that leprosy was a creation of mortal mind" (p. 217), that "if the lungs are disappearing, this is but one of the beliefs of mortal mind;" that "mortal man will be less mortal when he learns that the lungs never sustained existence, and can never destroy God who is our Life" (p. 423). "From human belief comes the reproduction of the species. . . . This embryotic and materialistic belief in turn fills itself with thoughts of pain and pleasure, of life and death, and arranges itself into five senses, which presently measure belief by the size of a brain, called mind, and the bulk of a body called matter." "Human birth, growth and decay are as the grass springing from the soil, with beautiful green blades—afterwards to wither and to return to its native nothingness. This mortal seeming is temporal, and never emerges into immortal being" (p. . . .). It makes us believe that we are "fatigued" (p. 113), or that we are sinful.

Some of these vaporings would seem to come of her premises. She holds that God is all, that God is good, that God is Spirit and life, that God is unchangeable. Hence, for her, there can be no real weariness, sickness, or sin, and no body or matter; but her premises are wrong and her inferences untrustworthy and contradictory to the views of God (as ex-

pressed in His word) and of man. Her teachings on ontology are a dump-heap of worthless and conflicting imaginings.

### III. *Her substitutes for the doctrines of the Christian Scriptures.*

We shall group these under the heads: 1st, Theological (in the narrow sense); 2d, Anthropological; 3d, Soteriological; 4th, Ecclesiological; 5th, Eschatological.

#### 1st. Theological:

(1) We have already seen that she teaches Pantheism. She says further, on page 8, of *Rudiments and Rules*, "I prefer to retain a proper sense of deity by using the phrase an *individual* God, rather than a personal God." She seemed unable to conceive of personality except as united to body, which she regarded as an illusion.

(2) She says of the Trinity: "The theory of three persons in one God (that is a personal Trinity, or Triunity), suggests heathen Gods, rather than the one ever-present I Am" (p. 152). "Life, Truth and Love constitute the triune God, or triply divine Principle. They represent a trinity in unity; three in one—the same in essence, though multi-form in office: God the Father; Christ the type of Sonship; Divine Science, or the Holy Comforter" (p. 227).

When it is shown, as will be done a little later, that Christ was, in her view, an emanation similar to your self, as she sees things, but recognizing better its character; and when you *remember* that the Divine Science, which is Christian Science, is the Holy Ghost, you will, of course, see that the Christian doctrine of the Trinity has been swept away.

(3) Mrs. Eddy lucubrates about what she calls creation. She says, *e. g.*, "Mind creates its own likeness in ideas, and the substance of an idea is very far from being the supposed substance of non-intelligent matter. Hence the Father of Mind is not the Father of matter. The material senses and

human conceptions would translate spiritual ideas into material beliefs, and say that an anthropomorphic god, instead of infinite Principles, is the Father of the brain" (p. 155). "Is Spirit the source, or creator, of matter? Science reveals nothing in Spirit *out of which to create* matter. Science repudiates matter (p. 174). She does not seem to have caught the conception of *de nihilo* creation. In this passage she talks as if creation were a mere making. So, again, she says: "Does God create man, who is called material, out of Himself, Spirit? . . . Can evil be derived from good? (p. 302). She betrays her Pantheism, showing that her notion of creation is that of the Pantheists, in passages not a few, *e. g.*, in this: "According to Christian Science, the true senses of man are spiritual, emanating from the divine mind" (p. 180).

(4) As for Providence, she has no place for it and, indeed, denies that there are special providences (pp. 648 and 13). She is consistent here. The Pantheist can know no providence. He says: "God goes on eternally, necessarily, but God is all."

How different is this theology proper from that of the Christian Scriptures:

"God is a spirit, infinite, eternal and unchangeable, in his being, wisdom, power, holiness, justice, goodness and truth."

"There are three persons in the Godhead, the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost; and these three are one God, the same in substance, equal in power and glory."

"God's work of creation is his making all things of nothing by the word of his power, in the space of six days, and all very good."

"God's works of providence are his most holy, wise, and powerful, preserving and governing all his creatures and all their actions."

It is convenient to notice her treatment of angels and demons, at this point.

She says: "Angels are God's impartations to man—not *messengers*, or persons, but *messages* of the true idea of divinity, flowing into humanity" (p. 195). "Jacob was *alone*, wrestling with error . . . when an angel, a message from Truth and Love, appeared to him, and smote the sinew, or strength of his error, till it was powerless" (p. 204).

According to her, the devil is "personified evil" (p. 302). She defines "Devil" as "Evil," a lie, error; neither corporeality nor mind; the opposite of truth; a belief in sin, sickness and death; animal magnetism; the lust of the flesh, which saith: "I am life and intelligence in matter. There is more than one mind, for I am mind—a wicked mind, self-made or created by Jehovah, and put into the opposite of mind termed matter, thence to reproduce a mortal universe, including man, not after the image and likeness of Spirit, but after my own image" (p. 575).

According to the Scriptures, Angels are pure spiritual personal beings, and the Devil, is one who was such a being, but who plunged into sin.

2d. *Anthropological*, or the doctrines concerning man when first created, concerning his fall, concerning man as a sinner.

(1) We have clearly seen that, according to Mrs. Eddy, man is not a creation of a different substance, or substances, from God, but an eternal emanation from God, His infinite idea, or reflection; that man is not to be described as personal, we being no more able to see what constitutes personality in his case than in God's; that he is as unchangeable as God; that he cannot be a sinner, since God cannot sin and God is the substance of man.

(2) We have already seen, that according to her evil-spiritual, or physical—is an illusion, a non-entity. But hear her further:

"Since God is All, there is no room for his opposite. He

alone created the real, and it is good; therefore evil, being the opposite of goodness is unreal" (p. 234). "Evil has no reality. It is neither person, place, nor thing, but is simply a belief, an illusion of material sense" (p. 237).

Contrast with this Scriptural Anthropology:

"God created man after his own image, in knowledge, righteousness and holiness, with dominion over the creatures."

"Man being left to the freedom of his own will, fell from the estate wherein he was created into an estate of sin and misery by sinning against God."

"Sin is any want of conformity unto or transgression of the law of God."

"The sinfulness of that estate whereunto man fell consists in the guilt of Adam's first sin, the want of original righteousness, and the corruption of his whole nature, which is commonly called original sin, together with all actual transgressions which do proceed from it."

"All mankind by their fall lost communion with God, are under his wrath and curse, and so made liable to all the miseries of this life, to death itself and to the pains of hell forever."

"God having out of his mere good pleasure, from all eternity, elected some to everlasting life, did enter into a covenant of grace to deliver them out of the estate of sin and misery and to bring them into an estate of salvation by a Redeemer."

### 3d. *Ethical Doctrines.*

Mrs. Eddy's ethical doctrines may be summed up in the maxim: Gather dollars for the Christian Science Monopoly—for Mrs. Eddy and her glory. Mark twain puts the motto of Christian Science as follows: "Do anything and everything your hand may find to do; and charge cash for it; and collect the money for it in advance (*Christian*

*Science*, p. 79). He might have added to this motto: In gathering the cash, despise all laws of God or man, as far as is compatible with safety.

She contributed nothing to the relief of the poor, nor taught her disciples to do so. Says Mark Twain:

“No charities to support. No, nor even to contribute to. One searches in vain the Trust’s advertisements and the utterances of its organs for any suggestion that it spends a penny on orphans, widows, discharged prisoners, hospitals, ragged schools, night missions, city missions, libraries, old peoples’ homes, or any other object that appeals to a human being’s purse through his heart.

“I have hunted, hunted and hunted, by correspondence and otherwise, and have not yet got upon the track of a farthing that the Trust has spent upon any worthy object. Nothing makes a Scientist so uncomfortable as to ask him if he knows of a case where Christian Science has spent money on a benevolence, either among its own adherents or elsewhere. He is obliged to say “No.” And then one discovers that the person questioned has been asked the question many times before, and that it is getting to be a sore subject with him. Why a sore subject? Because he has written his chiefs and asked with high confidence for an answer that will confound these questioners—and the chiefs did not reply. He has written again, and then again—not with confidence, but humbly, now—and has begged for defensive ammunition in the voice of supplication. A reply does at last come—to this effect: ‘We must have faith in our Mother, and rest content in the conviction that whatever She does with the money it is in accordance with orders from Heaven, for She does no act of any kind without first ‘demonstrating over’ it.’

“That settles it—as far as the disciple is concerned. His mind is satisfied with that answer; he gets down his Annex

and does an incantation or two, and that mesmerizes his spirit and puts that to sleep—brings it peace. Peace and comfort and joy, until some inquirer punctures the old sore again.

“Through friends in America, I asked some questions, and in some cases got definite and informing answers; in other cases the answers were not definite and not valuable. To the question, ‘Does any of the money go to charities?’ the answer from an authoritative source was : ‘No, *not in the sense usually conveyed by this word.*’ (The italics are mine). That answer is cautious. But definite, I think—utterly and unassailably definite—although quite Christian-Scientifically foggy in its phrasing. Christian Science testimony is generally foggy; generally diffuse, generally garrulous. The writer was aware that the first word in his phrase answered the question which I was asking, but he could not help adding nine dark words. Meaningless ones, unless explained by him. It is quite likely, as intimated by him, that Christian Science has invented a new class of objects to apply the word “charity” to, but without an explanation we cannot know what they are. We quite easily and naturally and confidently guess that they are in all cases objects which will return five hundred per cent. on the Trust’s investment in them, but guessing is not knowledge; it is merely, in this case, a sort of nine-tenths certainty deducible from what we think we know of the Trust’s trade principles, and its sly and furtive and shifty ways” (Christian Science, pp. 75-78).

#### 4th. *Soteriological doctrines, or her doctrines of Salvation.*

(1) Mrs. Eddy gives to Jesus Christ small place in man’s salvation. She could not openly displace him absolutely without handicapping herself in the endeavor to win nominal Christians to her false and anti-Christian ism. She needed them in order to get their very material dollars.

She teaches that in Christ Jesus there were two elements. Hear her: "Jesus was the highest *human* concept of a perfect man. He was inseparable from Christ, the Messiah—the divine idea of God—outside the flesh. This also enabled him to demonstrate, above all other men, his control over matter. . . . Angels announced to the wise men of old this dual appearing, and they whisper it, through faith to the hungering heart in every age" (p. 478). "The Christ element in the Messiah made him the way, the Truth, and Life (p. 184); "That saying of our Master, 'I and my Father are one, 'separated them from the scholastic theology of the Rabbis. . . . He knew of but one Mind, and laid no claim to any other" (p. 210). "Jesus was born of Mary, Christ was born of God. Jesus was a mediator between humanity and Spirit" (p. 227). "The divine idea, or Christ, was, and is, and ever will be inseparable from its divine Principle, God" (p. 229). "Christ is the idea of Truth, and this idea comes to heal sickness and sin, through Christian Science, which denies corporeal power. Jesus is the name of the man who has presented, more than all other men, this idea of God, for he came healing the sick and the sinful, and destroying power of death" (p. 469).

As to the errors in this basket of trash: I shall deal with only one of them. She abuses John 10:30, "I and the Father are one" to try to get out of it support for the crochet that there is but one mind. These words of Christ are full of meaning: "It is I, not the *Son*, the Father, not my Father; one essence (*Hen, Vulg. Unum*); not one person (*Heis, Gal. 3:28, unus*); *are not am.*" Christ is here revealed of the substance of the Godhead. But the passage does not at all teach that there is only one mind or soul, which is God, in all men. The context makes it plain that the thought was quite otherwise. The Jews were just then giving evidence of their unbelief and hostility.



Mrs. Eddy almost always keeps far away from Scripture. She was evidently much more afraid of it than of the Devil, evil or anything for which the Devil stands, in her vocabulary. But whenever she touches it, she muddies it.

(2) His work was that of the "Way-shower," according to Mrs. Eddy's teaching, that of a Mrs. Eddy before Mrs. Eddy's time, less perfect than she, as he labored under the "illusion" that he had a body and that there were such realities as sin and death. He made an atonement between man and God, in that he "taught and demonstrated" man's oneness with the Father—"Man's unity with God, whereby he reflects divine Truth, Life and Love"—in that he showed that man is not, and cannot be a sinner, since God is his substance, and he God's eternal idea. She teaches that his atonement destroys belief in matter (pp. 324, 325); destroys selfishness (p. 326), destroys sin, sickness and death (p. 324), shows mortals how to do their work (p. 323); but she denied that he suffered vicariously; "Final deliverance from error—whereby we rejoice in immortality, boundless freedom, and sinless sense—is neither reached through paths of flowers, nor by pinning one's faith to vicarious effort. Who-soever believeth that wrath is righteous, or that divinity is appeased by human suffering, does not understand God" (p. 327). "That God's wrath should be vented on his beloved Son is divinely unnatural. Such a theory is man-made. The atonement is a hard problem in theology; but its more reasonable explanation is, that suffering is an error of sinful sense, which Truth destroys, and that eventually both sin and suffering will fall at the feet of everlasting love" (p. 328).

This is another basket of trash: That "Christ was less perfect than Mrs. Eddy; that he made atonement only "by teaching and demonstrating man's oneness with the Father, showing that man cannot be a sinner since God is his sub-

stance; that he did not suffer vicariously for men; that God's wrath could never have been poured out on his Son, or on man; that suffering is no reality.

It deserves nothing but a puff of contempt. It is supported solely by Mrs. Eddy's assertions.

(3) She teaches accordingly that "with God there is no such thing as pardon. Divine love destroys death. Truth destroys error, and Love destroys hate. Being destroyed, sin needs no other form of forgiveness" (p. 234). "Sin is forgiven only as it is destroyed by Christ—Truth, Love." . . . "The divine Love corrects and governs man. Men may pardon, but this divine Principle alone reforms the sinner. God is not separate from the wisdom He bestows. The talents he gives we must improve. Calling on him to forgive our work badly done or left undone, implies the vain supposition that we have nothing to do but to ask pardon, and that afterwards we shall be free to repeat the offence" (p. 311). "To reach Heaven, the Harmony of Being, we must understand the divine Principle of being" (p. 311).

This shuts everybody out of heaven.

(4) Salvation, she teaches, is to be sought through reform and good works. Thus she says: "By interpreting God as a corporeal Savior" (she means personal Savior), "but not as the saving Principle, we shall continue to seek salvation through pardon, and not through reform, and resort to matter, instead of Spirit, for the cure of the sick" (p. 181). "We must work out our own salvation" (pp. 651 and 424).

She must be classed roughly with Pelagians on this point.

(5) The great saving instrumentality is not faith, according to Mrs. Eddy, but understanding. She says: "Faith advanced to spiritual understanding, is the evidence gained from Spirit, which rebukes material beliefs, and establishes the claims of God.

"In Hebrew, Greek, Latin and English, faith and the words corresponding thereto, have these two definitions, *trustfulness* and *trustworthiness*. One kind of faith trusts our welfare to another being. The other kind of faith understands how to work out one's own 'salvation, with fear and trembling.' 'Lord, I believe, help, thou, my unbelief!' expresses the helplessness of a blind faith; whereas the injunction, 'Believe and thou shalt be saved,' demands self-reliant trustworthiness which includes the understanding and confides all to God.

"The Hebrew verb *to believe* means also *to be firm* or to be constant. This certainly applies to Truth and Love, understood and practiced. Firmness in error will never save from sin, disease and death."

"Acquaintance with the original texts, and willingness to give up human beliefs (established by hierarchies and instigated sometimes by the worst passions of men), open the way for Christian Science to be understood and make the Bible the chart of Life, to mark healing currents and buoys of Truth" (pp. 328-329). "Spirit understands, and thus precludes the need of believing. . . . The believer and belief are one, and are mortal mind. . . . The understanding that Life is God lengthens our days by strengthening our trust in the deathless reality of life, its Almighty-ness and immortality" (p. 483).

Thus we have a false *gnosis* put in the place of faith of mind and heart and will.

(6) She makes the Holy Ghost, as we have seen, Divine Science (p. 579).

(7) It has become abundantly clear that that which man is to be saved from is his *illusions* of sin, sickness and death. He is to learn that there are no realities corresponding to these terms.

Contrast the Biblical soteriology:

"The only Redeemer of God's elect is the Lord Jesus Christ, who being the eternal Son of God, became man and so was and continued to be God and man in two distinct natures and one person forever." "Christ executeth the office of a prophet in revealing to us, by his word and spirit, the will of God for our salvation." "Christ executeth the office of a Priest in his once offering up of himself, a sacrifice to satisfy divine justice and reconcile us to God, and in making continued intercession for us. Christ executeth the office of a King in subduing us unto himself in ruling and defending us, and in restraining and conquering all his and our enemies." Him "God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God." "By grace are ye saved through faith and that not of yourselves; it is the gift of God; not of works lest any man should boast."

"Faith in Jesus Christ is a saving grace whereby we receive and rest on Christ for salvation as he is offered to us in the Gospel."

"Effectual calling is the work of God's Spirit, whereby convincing us of our sin and misery, enlightening our minds in the knowledge of Christ and renewing our wills, he doth persuade and enable us to embrace Jesus Christ freely offered to us in the Gospel."

5th. *Ecclesiological doctrines.*

(1) Mrs. Eddy defines the Church as "the structure of Truth and Love; whatever rests upon and proceeds from divine Principle." "The Church is that institution which affords proof of its utility, and is found elevating the race, rousing the dormant understanding from material beliefs, to the apprehension of spiritual ideas and the demonstration of Divine Science, thereby casting out devils, or error, and healing the sick" (p. 574).

"Jesus Christ purposed founding his society, not on the personal Peter, as a mortal man, but on the God power which lay behind his confession of the Messiah" (p. 31).

(2) Mrs. Eddy established an absolutely autocratic government in her Church. (Cf. M. Twain. *Ibid.*, p. 167).

(a) She herself assumed the humble-proud title of *Pastor-emeritus*; but she kept all power in her own hands.

(b) *Science and Health* was made *Universal Pastor* of the *Supreme Church in Boston, and in all Branch Churches*. The term of that pastorate to be forever.

(c) She provided for two Readers in every Christian Science pulpit, a man and a woman. She allows no talkers, no preachers in any pulpit—readers only. Readers of her books and the portions of the Scriptures which she has adapted, no others may be heard. She allowed no commentators to print or write without her supervision.

(d) She formed the order of worship—for all Christian Science Churches—determined its readings, hymns, thinking substitute for prayers, and Sacred Breakfast. She permits no changes.

(e) She wrote its creed and allows no other.

Mrs. Eddy was the whole power in the Church while she lived. (See *Manual of the First Church of Christ, Scientist*). True, she had Boards of Directors, Boards of Education, Boards of Finance, etc. But no member could be elected without her approval. No member could hold his seat for one minute longer than she pleased. Every member was a puppet through whom she indicated her will. Mark Twain says:

"Mrs. Eddy is the sovereign; she devised that great place for herself, she occupies that throne.

"In 1895, she wrote a little primer, a little body of autocratic laws, called the *Manual of the First Church of Christ, Scientist*, and put those laws in force, in permanence. Her

government is all there; all in that deceptively innocent-looking little book, that cunning little devilish book, that slumbering little brown volcano, with hell in its bowels. In that book she has planned out her system, and classified and defined its purpose and powers.

“MAIN PARTS OF THE MACHINE.

“A Supreme Church. At Boston.

“Branch Churches. All over the world.

“One pastor for the whole of them; to-wit, her book, Science and Health. Term of the book’s office—forever.

“In every C. S. pulpit, two ‘Readers,’ a man and a woman. No talkers, no preachers, in any Church—readers only. Readers of the Bible and her books—no others. No commentators allowed to write or print.

“A Church Service. She has framed it—for all the C. S. Churches—selected its readings, its prayers, and the hymns to be used, and has appointed the order of procedure. No changes permitted.

“A Creed. She wrote it. All C. S. Churches must subscribe to it. No other permitted.

“A Treasury. At Boston. She carried the key.

“A C. S. Book-Publishing House. For books approved by her. No others permitted.

“Journals and Magazines. These are organs of hers, and are controlled by her.

“A College. For teaching C. S.

*“Distribution of the Machine’s Powers and Dignities.*

“Supreme Church.

“Pastor Emeritus—Mrs. Eddy.

“Board of Directors.

“Board of Education.

“Board of Finance.

“College Faculty.

“Various Committees.

"Treasurer.

"Clerk.

"First Members (of the Supreme Church).

"Members of the Supreme Church.

"It looks fair, it looks real, but it is all a fiction.

"Even the title 'Pastor Emeritus' is a fiction. Instead of being merely an honorary and ornamental official, Mrs. Eddy is the only official in the entire body that has the slightest power. In her Manual, she has provided a prodigality of ways and forms whereby she can rid herself of any functionary in the government whenever she wants to. The officials are all shadows, save herself; she is the only reality. She allows no one to hold office more than a year—no one gets a chance to become over-popular or over-useful, and dangerous. "Excommunication" is the favorite penalty—it is threatened at every turn. It is evidently the pet dread and terror of the Church's membership.

"The member who thinks, without getting his thought from Mrs. Eddy before uttering it, is banished permanently. One or two kinds of sinners can plead their way back into the fold, but this one, never. To think—in the Supreme Church—is the New Unpardonable Sin.

"To nearly every severe and fierce rule, Mrs. Eddy adds this rivet: 'This by-law shall not be changed without the consent of the Pastor Emeritus.

"Mrs. Eddy is the entire Supreme Church, in her own person, in the matter of powers and authorities.

"Although she has provided so many ways of getting rid of unsatisfactory members and officials, she was still afraid she might have left a life-preserver lying around somewhere, therefore she devised a rule to cover that defect. By applying it, she can excommunicate (and this is perpetual again), every functionary connected with the Supreme Church, and every one of the twenty-five thousand members

of that Church, at an hour's notice—and do it all by herself without anybody's help.

“By authority of this astonishing by-law, she has only to say a person connected with that Church is secretly practising hypnotism or mesmerism; whereupon, immediate excommunication without a hearing, is his portion! She does not have to order a trial and produce evidence—her accusation is all that is necessary.

“Where is the Pope? and where the Czar? As the ballad says:

‘Ask of the winds that far away  
With fragments strewed the sea!’

“The Branch Church's pulpit is occupied by two ‘Readers.’ Without them the Branch Church is as dead as if its throat had been cut. To have control, then, of the Readers, is to have control of the Branch Churches. Mrs. Eddy has that control—a control wholly without limit, a control shared with no one.

“1. No Reader can be appointed to any Church in the Christian Science world without her express approval.

“2. She can summarily expel from his or her place any Reader, at home or abroad, by a mere letter of dismissal, over her signature, and without furnishing any reason for it, to either the congregation or the Reader.

“Thus she has an absolute control over all Branch Churches as she has over the Supreme Church. This power exceeds the Pope's.

“In simple truth, she is the only absolute sovereign in all Christendom. The authority of the other sovereigns has limits, hers has none. None whatever. And her yoke does not fret, does not offend. Many of the subjects of the other monarchs feel their yoke, and are restive under it; their loyalty is insincere. It is not so with this one's human property; their loyalty is genuine, earnest, sincere, enthusi-



astic. The sentiment which they feel for her is one which goes out in sheer perfection to no other occupant of a throne; for it is love, pure from doubt, envy, exaction, fault-seeking, a love whose sun has no spot—that form of love, strong, great, compassable by no word but one, the prodigious word, Worship. And it is not as a human being that her subjects worship her, but as a supernatural one, a divine one, one who has comradeship with God, and speaks by His voice.

“Mrs. Eddy has herself created all these personal grand-ours and autocracies—with others which I have not (in this article) mentioned. They place her upon an Alpine solitude and supremacy of power and spectacular show not hitherto attained by any other self-seeking enslaver disguised in the Christian name, and they persuade me that, although she may regard “self-deification as blasphemous,” she is as fond of it as I am of pie.” (Christian Science, pp. 343-349).

Since her death her power of government is vested in the Board of Directors of the First Church, Scientist, Boston.

(3) As to the rites of Baptism and the Lord's Supper: (a) She does not acknowledge the propriety of baptism with water (matter). She defines baptism as “Purification by the Spirit” (Christian Science), “submergence in Truth.” (b) The Lord's Supper (she declares is not needed) (p. 339). But she has instituted a breakfast “to commemorate Christ's ascension above matter” (p. 340).

(4) For worship she has read portions of *Science and Health* and portions of the Scriptures selected and adapted by herself; and substitutes a thinking exercise for prayer. This exercise of the understanding may be illustrated by her version of the “*Lord's Prayer*,” which is as follows:

“Our Father and Mother God, all harmonious.

“Adorable One.

“Ever just and omnipotent.

"Thy supremacy appears as matter disappears.

"Thou fillest our famished affections

"And love is reflected in love

"And ledest us not in temptation, but preservest us from sin, sickness and death;

"For thou art all Substance, Life, Truth and Love forever. So be it." *Science and Health, Edition 1886.*

She has no use for prayer, can't abide it. Listen to these words:

"God is love. Can we ask Him to be more? God is intelligence. Can we inform the Infinite Mind or tell him anything he does not comprehend? Do we hope to change perfection? Shall we plead for more at the open fount, which always pours forth more than we receive? Does spoken prayer bring us nearer the source of all existence and blessedness?" (p. 308).

Her definition of the Church makes it a different institution from that founded in the family of Abraham, cradled in the wilderness, developed under David, reformed at Pentecost and spread over all continents through much tribulation and toil as the ages have passed.

Her scheme of government is antipodal to the spiritual republic enjoined in God's word.

The simple rites of baptism and the Lord's Supper, were to be, by the authority of Jesus, administered throughout this world age till he should come again.

Prayer, including petition, supplication, and intercession, were enjoined by Apostles, and by Christ himself as of perpetual obligation.

#### 6th. *Eschatological doctrines:*

1. She teaches of death that it is a mere illusion: Thus she says: "The fact that Christ, or Faith, overcame death, proves the King of terrors to be but a mortal belief, or error, which Truth destroys with the spiritual evidences of Life;

and this shows that what appears to the senses to be death is but a mortal illusion; for to the real man and the real universe there is no death process."

"The belief that matter has life results, by the universal law of mortal mind, in a belief in death. So man, tree and flower are supposed to die; but the fact remains, that God's universe is spiritual and immortal." . . .

"Matter and death are mortal illusions" (p. 185). "Death will be found at length to be a mortal dream, which comes in darkness and disappears with the light" (p. 347). "Man is immortal, and the body cannot die, because it has no life to surrender. The illusions named death, disease, sickness and sin are all that can be destroyed" (p. 424).

This illusion seems to have caught up Mrs. Eddy herself and whisked her away. Every Christian Scientist practically gives the lie to the doctrine, though he profess it with lip: when death comes and breaks up the castle of the soul of a friend, the Christian Scientist believes that there has been a real dissolution of a real body, and shows it by his acts. He lays the body in a grave.

2. As to the second coming of Christ, she teaches that His second coming was in the coming of "Christian Science" (p. 599). With which compare pp. 43 and 293.

3. Of the resurrection, she declares that it is "Spiritualization of thought; a new and higher idea of immortality, or spiritual existence; material belief yielding to spiritual understanding" (p. 584).

But while the Scripture sometimes uses the word resurrection in a metaphorical sense, it often uses it of a raising literally of a literal man (a spiritual and corporeal being). Thus the Bible predicates the raising of Lazarus from bodily death. See John XI. Thus it teaches the resurrection of Christ. Thus it teaches that the resurrection of all men is to occur.

4. As to future suffering, she says: "Science reveals the necessity of sufficient suffering, either before or after death to quench the love of sin. To remit the penalty due for sin would be for Truth to pardon error" (p. 341).

But "Science" "reveals" a great jumble; for it reveals that man cannot suffer, that he is the reflection of God—the infinite idea of the infinite God—ever blessed and perfect; that "he is incapable of sin as well as of sickness and death, inasmuch as he derives his essence from God," that "he cannot depart from holiness" (p. 471). Yet as above, "Science reveals the necessity of sufficient suffering, either before or after death to quench the love of sin. To remit the penalty due for sin would be for Truth to pardon error" (p. 341).

5th. As to the *Judgment*, she teaches:

"No final judgment awaits mortals; for the judgment day of Wisdom comes hourly and continually, even the judgment by which mortal man is divested of all material error. As for spiritual error, there is none" (p. 182).

But, says Paul, God "hath appointed a day in the which he will judge the world in righteousness by that man whom he hath ordained whereof he hath given assurance, in that he hath raised him from the dead." Acts 17:31.

Further, why does Mother Goose (Eddy) talk of sin, if there be no "spiritual error?"

How different the eschatology of the Scriptures:

"The souls of believers are at their death made perfect in holiness, and do immediately pass unto glory; and their bodies being still united to Christ, do rest in their graves till the resurrection. At the resurrection, believers being raised up in glory, shall be openly acknowledged and acquitted in the day of judgment and made perfectly blessed in the full enjoying of God to all eternity."

IV. *Christian Science as a System of Healing.*

Christian Scientists are wont to declare that there is no need for physicians, that the profession of the Surgeon might be abolished for the good of humanity, "that Science" can cure every disease that man suffers from without the aid of medicine or knife.

Mrs. Eddy says:

"My first plank in the platform of Christian Science is as follows: There is no life, truth, or substance in matter."

"Matter is unreal and temporal."

"God is all and in all. What can be more than all? Nothing; and this is just what I call matter—nothing."

"Here is found the pith of the basal statement of the cardinal point of Christian Science, that matter and evil (including all inharmony, sin, disease, death) are unreal."

"Sin, sickness, and death . . . are without real origin, or existence. They have neither principle nor permanence, but belong with all that is material or temporal, to the nothingness of error which imitates the creation of deity."

With this creed, it is not to be wondered that Mrs. Eddy and her followers should array themselves against all the intelligence and real science of mankind. If her creed be correct, no sickness ever existed, no broken arm ever needed setting, no teeth ever needed pulling, no member ever needed amputation. Do you wonder that her creed was not rectified by her senses? She denies the existence of the senses. Hear her words:

"Any supposed information coming from the body or from inert matter, as if they were intelligent, is an illusion of the mortal mind—one of its dreams. Realize that the evidence of the senses is not to be accepted in the case of sickness any more than in the case of sin."

No wonder that Mrs. Eddy and her followers oppose the medical fraternity, boards of health, and municipal hygiene.

Though she reiterates, over and over again, that there is

no such thing as disease, she gives careful instructions for the healing of various diseases. See, e. g., pages 422 and 423 of "*Science and Health*," her instructions as to the treatment of consumption:

"If the case to be mentally treated is consumptive, take up the leading points included (according to belief) in this disease. Show that it is not inherited; that inflammation, tubercles, hemorrhage and decomposition are beliefs, images of mortal thoughts, superinduced upon the body; that they are not the Truth of man; that they should be treated as error; and put out of thought. Then these ills will disappear. If the lungs are disappearing, this is but one of the beliefs of mortal mind. Mortal mind will be less mortal when it learns that lungs never sustained existence and can never destroy life, who is God. When this is understood, man will be more godlike. What if the lungs are ulcerated? God is more to a man than his lungs; and the less we acknowledge matter and its laws, the more immortality we possess. Never believe that lungs or any portion of the body can destroy you."

Is this the raving of an insane person? May you live without lungs your present life? Is the way to rid yourself of disease to think that there is nothing the matter with you?

Such "scientific" instructions as the following are given to Mrs. Eddy's disciples:

"He who is ignorant of what is termed hygienic law is more receptive of spiritual power and faith in one God than the devotee of this supposed law" (p. 381).

"The less we know or think about hygiene, the less we are predisposed to sickness" (p. 388).

"Physiology is one of the apples of the Tree of Knowledge—error declared that eating this fruit would open man's eyes and make him a god. Instead of so doing, it closes

man's eyes to man's God-given dominion over the earth. Obedience to the so-called physical laws of health have not checked sickness."

"Physiology exalts matter and dethrones mind" (p. 43).

"When there are fewer doctors and less thought given to sanitary subjects there will be better constitutions and less disease" (p. 67).

"In families where laws of health are strictly observed there is most sickness." (*Miscellaneous Writings*, p. 6).

No wonder, we repeat, that Christian Scientists neglect all precautions against the spread of disease, and disregard the sanitary laws of towns, clash with boards of health, and let many of their patients die for lack of simple and accessible remedies.

Do Christian Scientists do cures?

Yes, on hypochondriacs.

Mark Twain tells us of his *experiences*:

"The Christian Scientist was not able to cure my stomach ache and my cold; but the horse doctor did it. This convinces me that Christian Science claims too much. In my opinion it ought to let diseases alone and confine itself to surgery. There it would have everything its own way.

"The horse doctor charged me thirty kreutzers, and I paid him; in fact, I doubled it and gave him a shilling. Mrs. Fuller brought in an itemized bill for a crate of broken bones mended in two hundred and thirty-four places—one dollar a fracture.

"Nothing exists but Mind?"

"Nothing," she answered, "All else is substanceless, all else is imaginary."

"I gave her an imaginary check, and now she is suing me for substantial dollars. It looks inconsistent." (*Christian Science*, p. 38). See also *Ibid.*, p. 64-65.

Christian Science may also encourage the really sick to hope for health and thus help cure them.

The like cures have been wrought throughout the ages.

V. *The System Known By Its Fruits.*

Born at Bow, near Concord, New Hampshire, July 16, 1821, Mary Baker grew up an agile, lithe, graceful girl, with an imperious will and a nervous hysterical temperament. She was married first in 1843, to George Washington Glover, a young brick-layer, who died about one year later. She bore one child to this husband. For that child she "never showed any affection." For some years she lived with her old father and during the whole period punctured the time with nervous collapses. In 1853 she was married a second time, to Dr. Daniel Patterson, who bore with her tantrums for some years. In 1862 she visited "Dr." Quimby, of Portland, Maine, who practiced mind-healing; claimed to have been healed by him, and became his enthusiastic admirer and disciple. She taught the Quimby method of healing up to about 1868 or 1870. About the year 1870, she began to represent herself as having received, in 1866, by special revelation from God, the system of Christian Science. She published her book *Science and Health*, in 1875, a book which she had to revise many times, notwithstanding the fact that it was "given by immediate revelation." She married, in 1877, A. G. Eddy, who died in 1882. Between 1870 and the end of her life, she became immensely wealthy.

Her life, after she developed her system, showed no improvement in character. She was a liar, and an impostor to the end, full of arrogance, and all impiety, making herself a greater than Christ.

Her dishonesty is evidenced by the following: In 1887, in the June issue of the *Christian Science Journal*, she affirms: "As long ago as 1844, I was convinced that mortal mind produced all disease." "In 1862 I was proclaiming that Science must govern all healing," but in the first edi-



tion of *Science and Health*, issued in 1875, it is stated that its author first learned in 1864 that "Science mentally applied would heal the sick." She has affirmed again: "It was in Massachusetts, February, 1866, and after the death of the magnetic doctor, Mr. P. P. Quimby, whom Spiritualists would associate therewith, but who was in no wise connected with this event, that I discovered the Science of Metaphysical Healing, which I afterwards named Christian Science." (Marsden, *The Mask of Christian Science*, pp. 43-44).

Mark Twain, after an exhaustive study of Mrs. Eddy's known writings and comparison of them with *Science and Health*, sums up his conclusions:

"Inasmuch as—in my belief—the very first editions of the book *Science and Health*, were far above the reach of Mrs. Eddy's mental and literary abilities, I think she has from the very beginning been claiming as her own another person's book and wearing as her own property laurels rightfully belonging to that person—the real author of *Science and Health*. And I think the reason—and the only reason—that he has not protested, is because his work was not exposed to print until after he was safely dead." M. Twain, *Christian Science*, p. 292, Cf., also pp. 289-292.

As illustrative of her arrogant and blasphemous claims may be cited, from *Science and Health*, pp. 551-552, the following:

"The twelfth chapter of the Apocalypse—or Revelation of Saint John—has a special suggestiveness in connection with the nineteenth century. In the opening of the Sixth Seal, typical of six thousand years since Adam, the distinctive feature has special reference to the present age.

"Revelation 12:1. And there appeared a great wonder in Heaven—a woman clothed with the sun, and the moon under her feet, and upon her head a crown of twelve stars."

Another instance:

"While we entertain decided views . . . and shall express them as duty demands, we shall claim no special gift from our divine origin" (cited from her Miscellaneous Writings, by M. Twain, Christian Science, p. 149).

Another instance:

"No person can take the individual place of the Virgin Mary. No person can compose or fulfill the individual mission of Jesus of Nazareth. No person can take the place of the author of *Science and Health*, the discoverer and founder of Christian Science. Each individual must fill his own niche in time and eternity." *Autobiography*, p. 96, quoted in M. Twain. *Ibid*, p. 146. See also M. Twain. *Ibid.*, pp. 22-24, 44-46, 67-70.

Another instance:

"It is often asked why Christian Science was revealed to me—as one annihilating the false testimony of the physical senses. . . . No one else can *drain the cup which I have drunk to the dregs*, as the discoverer and teacher of Christian Science; neither can its inspiration be gained without tasting the cup. . . . No mortal could have first informed the human mind of what the mortal and carnal cannot discern."

Another instance:

"'In the Christian Science Journal for April, 1889, when it was her property, and published by her, it was claimed for her, and with her sanction, that she was equal with Jesus. and elaborate effort was made to establish the claim.'"

"'Mrs. Eddy has distinctly authorized the claim in her behalf, that she herself was the chosen successor to and equal of Jesus.'"

"The following remark in that April number, quoted by Mr. Peabody, indicates that her claim had been previously made, and had excited 'horror' among some 'good people':

“‘Now, a word about the horror many good people have of our making, the author of Science and Health ‘equal with Jesus.’”

“Surely, if it had excited horror in Mrs. Eddy also, she would have published a disclaimer. She owned the paper; she could say what she pleased in its columns. Instead of rebuking her editor, she lets him rebuke those ‘good people’ for objecting to the claim.

“These things seem to throw light upon those words ‘our (my) divine origin.” *Christian Science*, pp. 354-355.

Mark Twain has given the following brief description of Mrs. Eddy’s character after a study extending through several years:

“Grasping, sordid, jenurious, famishing for everything she sees—money, power, glory—vain, untruthful, jealous, despotic, arrogant, insolent, pitiless where thinkers and hypnotists are concerned, illiterate, shallow, incapable of reasoning outside of commercial lines, immeasurably selfish.” *Christian Science*, p. 285.

“By their fruits ye shall know them,” says a better authority than Mrs. Eddy.

How are you to meet Christian Science in a community infected:

Take Luther’s method of dealing with the Zwickan Prophets:

1. He did not name the cattle.
2. He preached the truth which they misinterpreted, and they fled.

II. To put this suggestion otherwise:

1. Christian Science denies the doctrine of Providence. Preach that doctrine and the comfort it gives to the child of God, as it is set forth in Rom. 8.

2. Christian Science denies sin, preach that doctrine and

prove it from history, consciousness, and God's word. You will carry conviction.

3. Christian Science magnifies its cures. Show that throughout the ages similar cures have been wrought—cures of hypochondriacs, and cures of persons really ill, but who needed not only physical remedies but the aid of the will to live and of hope to live. For the influence of the mind over the body is considerable.

The Unity School of  
Christianity;  
and New Thoughtism

## Wayward Children of Mother Eddy:-

Mrs. Eddy has some bastard ecclesiastical offspring. Amongst these is the Unity School of Christianity, with its headquarters in Kansas City, Mo. This School claims a devotion to what it terms "Practical Christianity and Christian Healing". It claims to be an exponent of the doctrine of Jesus Christ, to apply that teaching to the affairs of daily life, to explain how it affects the body, producing sickness or health, and to show how man may produce conditions of health, happiness and prosperity in his life here and now.

That it is a child of Christian Science is proven by many marks: its peculiar form of pantheism, its doctrine of providence, its doctrine of mortal mind, its doctrine of salvation, its doctrine of the Devil, its doctrine as to the power of affirmations and denials, its doctrine of faith. These unmistakably point to Mother Eddy as parent, notwithstanding elements of change which have been introduced.

The doctrine of prayer is not as annihilative of the exercise as Mrs. Eddy's. There is an independence of Mrs. Eddy's government. There is an effort at an independent exposition of Scripture and of philosophy. There is an irenicism toward Christian sects more honest than Mrs. Eddy's; but the school or schools, for the unity is only a claimed one, is at bottom Eddyite.

It hardly calls for separate refutation. The refutation of Christian Science is the refutation of The Unity School of Christianity. The literature of the school may be happily sampled in Cady: *Lesson in Truth*, Fillmore: *Christian Healing*.

Another bastard child of Mrs. Eddy's is *New Thought*.

For an illustration of New Thought teaching see Paul Ellsworth's *The Gist of New Thought*. According to this

booklet: Our well being is to be attained only by recognizing that "man is but the outward terminal of an inner life and power, and that fully and perfectly to express this unseen life, he must bring his desires and activities into harmony with its purposes and laws of action"———that we are modes of God and have all the forces of the divine nature on which to draw, in order to the reaching of our highest well being. Morning and night, therefore, we are to make the following statement ours: "*I am an expression of Divine life, and in vitality, in body, and affairs I show forth the limitless love, power and wisdom of my Father.*"

"The only limit in regard to Mind Power is that it must be used creatively." This follows from "The fact of oneness of all life." Hence man should school himself to say "*Thou in me art creative love, and in every thought, desire and action I express thy nature.*"

To transform a life of failure, sickness or disappointment into one of glorious success, advantage must be taken of two principles: (1) Man has not within his boundaries all the materials for mastery. Beyond and above him is his own Greater Self, his Spiritual Self, which is one with the Father, and only as he finds himself in this higher centre of consciousness can he speak with authority. (2) *Truth never changes or diminishes, but only the part of it which we put to work is of avail to us.* We must address this living but unseen presence "which is one with us in all that is real and eternal in our being and claim this unity by saying, e. g. "*I am in Thee, and Thou in me.*" "*Thou art in me glorious health.*" By bringing ourselves into use of our "subjective" or subconscious mind, into the use of the Father we can speak with authority, speak as God.

The results will not come at once, but come they will.

To get away from sickness you must get out of the

world. And the key here is affirmation, the direct and dynamic statement of Truth. The truth is that as the child of God you are not subject to sickness. The Father, working in and through you, is Health, and Power, and Joy. It is only your limited, personal self that builds sickness and imperfection. In order to heal "Take any direct and simple statement of your unity with him, *Thou in me are glorious health, or I am in Thee and Thou in Me.* "In the work of healing or bodily regeneration your power lies in the fact that you are the expression of infinite resources. And you are to apply this power *first* by accepting it and putting it into the dynamic form of affirmation; second, by visualizing it, seeing your body vibrant with the divine life which you are, *third*, by feeding it, searching out those life vibrations which have been long sending you their message of co-operation, but which you have ignored; and fourth, by making such readjustments in your habits of thinking, feeling and doing as the Spirit of Wisdom teaches you to make."

The truth that frees is to be gotten not by observation nor by reason but by wisdom, the influx into the soul of Divine Light.

To realize wisdom affirm:

"Thou in me art illumination, and through Thee I know the truth which frees from every limitation.

"I am the light of the world; if any man follow me, he shall not walk in darkness, but shall have the light of life."  
 . . . .

"Man has a providence, faculty or center within him, which, when connected directly with the central power-house of Divine Mind will unfailingly attend to the work of material supply."

"Here are some key thoughts to help you quicken this providing faculty:"



"Thou art my filling supply, and in Thee I express financial mastery."

"I thank Thee, Father, that even now Thou dost bring into visibility in my life all that I desire."

"I am creative mastery and financial success; abundant supply comes naturally and unfailingly to me, because I am attractive to it."

"Here are a few affirmations for bringing out creative mastery."

"It is not I but the Father in me who doeth this work."

I can do all things through the Christ life which quicken me.

"Thou in me art glorious power, creative mastery, and in Thee I work swiftly and perfectly.

"Thou are the reality of my being, and Thou are glorious health, masterful expression and abounding financial success.

#### Remarks:

1st. It is clear that Ellsworth's New Thought is pantheism, and of the Christian Science type, fundamentally; God is the one reality. Men and things are God's expression.

2nd. The same absurd system of healing, essentially is taught, to wit, by thinking that you are God and that, as God cannot be sick, you cannot be sick.

The similarity to Christian Science is such that we easily accept the historic evidence as valid, that *New Thought* is the bastard child of Mother Eddy.

## Russellism

This is one of the most insidious  
of all the modernisms

## Literature on Russellism

---

C. T. Russell, *Studies in the Scriptures*, 6 Series.

Lawyer, *A Great Ecclesiastical Battle in the Heavens*.

Haldeman, *Two Men and Russellism*.

Haldeman, *A Great Counterfeit, or The False and Blasphemous, Religion Called Russellism and Millennial Dawnism*.

Haldeman, *Millennial Dawnism, the Blasphemous Religion Which Teaches the Annihilation of Jesus Christ*.

Chas. C. Cook, *More Data on Pastor Russell*.

I. I. Ross, *Some Facts and More Facts about the Self-Styled Pastor Russell (of Millennial Dawn Fame)*.

Chas C. Cook, *All About One Russell*.

## Russellism

---

By Russellism is meant the teaching of Charles T. Russell, as set forth in his work, once published in (six) volumes, entitled "Millennial Dawn," and later published under the caption "Studies in the Scriptures."

This work claims for itself publication under the auspices of the "International Bible Students Association, Brooklyn, London, Melbourne, Bremen, Elberfeld, Orebro, Christina." The copyright is held by "Watch Tower Bible and Tract Society, Brooklyn, U. S. A." A note on the reverse of the title page of volume I, asserts that "This volume can also be supplied in the German, Swedish, Dano-Norwegian, Finnish, French, Greek, Italian, Hungarian, Hollandish, Spanish, Polish, Slovak, Arabic, Chinese and Japanese languages, also in Braille (for the blind)."

There are reasons why this ism should be given a degree of study: (1) It has been given the shrewdest and most efficient advertising over vast areas of this earth's surface. The books are sold at a nominal price. There is an edition which may be had for twenty-five cents per volume. They are given to persons who wish them, but are too poor to buy them. The views set forth in them are published also in millions of tracts and in the official paper, or magazine, known as "The Herald of Christ's presence." (2) The ism makes a powerful appeal to people, of small capacity to reason, or small disposition to study God's word in a historic way, of large credulity, of readiness to follow the teacher who will speak with an air of prophetic certainty, or reason plausibly—to such people, when conscious of sin and in dread of its consequences. (3) It has already infected

and unsettled vast numbers of such people; and it has bothered many of a different and nobler type. The latter have not yet received it, but for lack of time, or conveniences, they have not been able to appraise Russellism in a satisfactory way, and to fix upon a proper course of conduct to be pursued with reference to it. (4) It is a pernicious, blasphemous and Satanic teaching—lulling to sleep multitudes, many of whom might, but for it, be led to seek life eternal in Christ Jesus.

For these and kindred reasons the following sketch and criticism of Russellism has been made.

1. *Of Russell's Theology Proper, or his doctrine, as to the existence and attributes of the Gods, as to the Plan of the Supreme God; as to creation and as to Providence.*

1st. *His doctrine of the Gods:*

1. With some considerations of force and with others destitute of either force or plausibility, Russell teaches that the light of nature discloses the existence of a supreme intelligent creator, of immeasurable power and wisdom, benevolence and justice, who will make known to his intelligent creatures his plan concerning them in "some such revelation as the Bible claims to be; and maintains the view that the Bible is a divinely inspired revelation."

Notwithstanding this expressed view of the Bible, we must beware of thinking that he gives the Bible the premier place in the teaching of theological truth. On page 198, of his "Watch Tower" of the issue of September 15, 1910, it is written concerning his books:

"If the six volumes of 'Scripture Studies' are practically the Bible, topically arranged, with Bible proof texts given, we might not improperly name the volumes, 'The Bible in Arranged Form.' That is to say, they are not merely comments on the Bible, but they are practically the Bible itself.

. . . "Furthermore, not only do we find that people

cannot see the divine plan in studying the Bible by itself, but we see also that if any one lays the 'Scripture Studies' aside, even after he has used them, after he has become familiar with them, after he has read them for ten years—if he lays them aside and ignores them and goes to the Bible alone, though he has understood his Bible for ten years, our experience shows that within two years, he goes into darkness. On the other hand, if he had merely the Scripture studies, with their references and had not read a page of the Bible as such he would be in the right at the end of the two years, because he would have the light of the Scriptures." (Quoted in Chas. C. Cook's "All About One Russell," pp. 13-14).

It thus appears that the Bible is light-giving according to Russell, only as interpreted by himself.

From the Scriptures thus "reasonably interpreted" (i. e., interpreted according to Russell's views), and from many interpolations from his own "reason" such as to give the Scriptures the sense which he wishes to find in them, he proceeds to set forth his views concerning the nature of the Gods.

2. Of "the God," the one Almighty God, Russell teaches that He has "mind and body." He says: "Some may be a little startled by this expression, 'a divine body,' but we are told that Jesus is the express image of his Father's person. . . . We could not imagine either our divine Father or our Lord Jesus as merely great minds without bodies," p. 200, Vol I., "Studies in the Scriptures."

Now, God, in His word, not only gives us no ground for regarding Him as having a body, but represents himself as pure spirit, ascribing to Himself attributes such as unchangeableness, unity, omnipresence, which body cannot have. "God is a Spirit," John 4:24; "The heaven and heaven of heavens cannot contain Thee," I Kings 8:27; "Who (the Son)

is the image of the invisible God," Col. 1:15; "the invisible," I Tim. 1:17; "As seeing Him who is invisible," Heb. 11:27.

3. Russell, in his further teaching concerning God, misrepresents ridicules and denies the doctrine of the Trinity.

(1) He misrepresents the doctrine of the Trinity, which he calls "this confusing *doctrine* of men" (Vol. 5, p. 54),\* and declares that for it "no authority can be found in the word of God." That he misrepresents, ridicules and denies the doctrine is clear from the following quotations:

"How could there be *three* Gods and yet only *one* God. If there are three Gods, "equal in power and glory," as the catechisms declare, then it is untrue to say there is only *one* God. If there is only "one God, the Father of whom are all things," as St. Paul asserts; and if, as Jesus declared, the Father is greater than his honored Son; and if the Father raised his Beloved Son from the dead, and *exalted him on high*, honored him, and has appointed for him a Kingdom; and if ultimately the Son will deliver up the Kingdom again to the Father, that he may be all in all; then it cannot be true that there are *several Gods of equal power*. Nevertheless, we shall show conclusively in the succeeding chapter that our Lord Jesus Christ is *a God*, but that . . . still the united voice of the Scriptures most emphatically assert that there is but one Almighty God, the Father of whom are all things," Vol. 5, p. 55.

"Moreover, the words 'Father' and 'Son' imply a difference and contradict the thoughts of the Trinity and oneness of person, because the word "father" signifies life-giver, while the word 'son' signifies the one who *has received life* from another," Vol. 5, p. 60.

"The idea of claiming *three Gods*, and at the same time claiming that the three were only one God, was no doubt considered a masterstroke in theology by which the views

---

\*These references to volumes and pages are to the volumes and pages of "Studies in the Scriptures," by Russell.

of believers converted from amongst the Jews could be brought into closer accord with the general sentiments of the Gentiles, who, it was desired, should be pleased and brought into the Church." Vol. 5, p. 63.

"At the same time it is admitted that the doctrine is *incomprehensible*, and therefore that nobody really believes it, because nobody can, in a true sense, believe an incomprehensible thing. And various doctrines and practices, not only of Protestantism, but also of Catholicism, deny the doctrine of the Trinity: note, for instance, that all Protestants pray to the Father, '*in the name of Jesus,*' '*for Jesus' sake,*' etc., thus recognizing the fact that there are two separate persons and not one person. Vol. 5, p. 64.

Again, he speaks of "the unreasonable and unscriptural doctrine of a Trinity—three Gods in *one person.*" Vol. 5, p. 76.

Quotations of like character might be multiplied in support of our present contention that he misrepresents and the ridicules and denies the doctrine of the Trinity. To them might be added his teachings that the Son, prior to his being made man, existed only as a created, angelic existence, and that the Holy Spirit is nothing more than the influence, or power, of God, that He has no distinct personal existence. Quotations showing unmistakably that he does these latter things are to be given later.

(2) Contrast now the true orthodox doctrine of the Trinity as held by the Greek and Roman Catholic Churches.

"There are three persons in the Godhead: the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost; and these three are one God, the same in substance, equal in power and glory."

This is no doctrine of tritheism—that there are three individual Gods. We shall find Russell teaching, that there is a plurality of Gods now—that the Almighty, *the* God who always has been, exists now; and that the Lord Jesus Christ



has been made a God, and exists as such now; and, apparently that true believers who sacrificed their lives in the gospel age have been made Gods and exist as such now. But of this hereafter. Observe that in his pantheon there are at least two Gods—the eternal self-existent God and a being who has been created a God. His view of Christ approaches that of the heretic Arius. He is a kind of ditheist.

The orthodox doctrine distinguishes between substance and person, a distinction to which Russell seems to be dead; it affirms one substance but a three-fold personal distinction in this one substance. The church was driven to this doctrine by the clear Scripture teaching that God is one, and yet that the Father is God, the Son is God and the Holy Spirit is God. It does, of course, not teach that God is one and three in the same sense. It is guilty of no contradiction, just as it is guilty of no contradiction when it asserts that man is dual as to substance unitary as to personality.

The evidences for the truth of a doctrine may be the strongest and yet the doctrine incomprehensible. Here is John Smith, who teaches that a Jersey cow feeding on a blue grass field, turns some portions of her feed into constituents of milk and other portions into fat and others into muscles. Now, must I wait till I can comprehend everything about these processes—how they are carried on—before believing what said Smith teaches as to the cow's uses of the grass in these ways. Further, C. T. Russell should, of all men, for his own sake, avoid teaching that a man cannot believe what he cannot comprehend. For he teaches amongst many incomprehensible things concerning *his* Christ some impossible things, e. g., that he was changed from a "spirit being" into a "human being," which, he teaches, is *not a spirit*, even in part, teaches that that *human being*, Jesus, died, became non-existent, and remains so forever; and

that Jesus Christ was called into existence at the end of three days, as a Spirit, lives today and ever will as a Spirit being, and of a type infinitely higher than that of his former spirit being, having been elevated to the divine nature. Russell's teachings teem not only with incomprehensibles, but with real impossibles and contradictories; but let us now to his doctrine of the Son.

4. *Russell teaches of the Lord Jesus Christ. Hear his words:*

"Some claimed that he (Christ) was an *impostor*: Some that he was merely a good man: some that he had a miraculous birth, but never had a *pre-existence*; and others held the truth, viz., that he had pre-existence as a Son of God on a spiritual plane, that he became the Son of God on a human plane, in order to redeem mankind and that now he is highly exalted, so that all are commanded to honor "the Son even as they honor the Father." Vol. 5, pp. 62, 63.

"Searching the Scriptures carefully to note just what they do say, and what they do not say, respecting our Lord Jesus, we find their testimony very explicit, harmonious and satisfactory. We will first state in synoptical form, what we find to be the Scriptural teachings, the proofs of which we will give further along:

"(1) Our Redeemer existed as a spirit being before he was made flesh and dwelt amongst men.

"(2) At that time, as well as subsequently, he was properly known as 'a god'—a mighty one. As chief of the angels and next to the Father, he was known as the Archangel (highest angel or messenger), whose name, Michael, signifies, 'Who is God,' or God's representative.

"(3) As he was the highest of all Jehovah's creation, so also he was the first, the direct creation of God, the only begotten and then he, as Jehovah's representative, and in the exercise of Jehovah's power, and in his name, created

all things—angels, principalities and powers, as well as the earthly creation. . . .

“(4) This humiliation to Man’s condition was not intended to be perpetual. It accomplished its purpose when our Lord had given himself, a human being, as our *ransom*, or “corresponding price.” Hence, his resurrection was not in the flesh, but, as the Apostle declares, “He was put to death in the flesh, but quickened in Spirit.” I Pet. 3:18.

“(5) His resurrection not only restored to him a spirit nature, but in addition conferred upon him a still higher honor, and, as the Father’s reward for his faithfulness, made him partaker of the *divine nature*—the very highest of the Spirit natures, possessed of immortality.” Vol. 5, pp. 83, 84. Cf., also, Vol. I., pp. 176, 179.

The meaning of these statements is made clearer by other statements of Russell’s. Thus he writes:

“Nor do the Scriptures in any place intimate that the existence of the Only Begotten ever ceased from the time it began, as “the beginning of the creation of God,” until it ceased at Calvary for three days; after which he was raised from the dead to die no more, death having never more dominion over him.” Vol. 5, p. 90.

Commenting on John 1:11, “The *logos* was made flesh and dwelt among us,” he writes:

“The common thought in respect to our Lord’s manifestation in the flesh is usually expressed in the word *incarnation*. This usual thought we believe to be wholly incorrect, unscriptural.” (He proceeds to show that he does not understand the orthodox doctrine of the incarnation, and to condemn his misconceived doctrine). (p. 94, Vol. 5).

“There was no sham about it: it was not that he merely appeared to humble himself, while really retaining his glory and power: it was not that he seemed to become poor for our sakes, yet actually remained rich in the possession of

the higher spiritual nature all the time; it was not that he merely put on the clothing, the livery, of a servant. No, but he actually became a *man*—"the man Christ Jesus who gave himself a ransom for all." I Tim. 2:5."

"We shall see subsequently, when we come to consider particularly the ransom feature of his work, that it was absolutely necessary that he should be a man—neither more nor less than a perfect man—because it was a man that sinned, a man that was redeemed, and the divine law required that a man's life should pay the redemption price of a man's life." Vol. 5, p. 95.

"Nor could our Lord have been raised from the dead a *man*, and yet have left with Justice our *ransom-price*: in order to the release of Adam and his condemned race from the sentence and prison-house of Death, it was necessary not only that the *man* Christ Jesus should die, but just as necessary that the man Christ Jesus should never live again, should remain dead, should remain our ransom-price to all eternity." Vol. 5, p. 454.

He teaches that Christ's "human existence ended on the cross," that "after being dead three days, he was raised to life—to the perfection of spirit being—born of the Spirit—"the first-born from the dead"— . . . Jesus, therefore, at and after his resurrection, was a spirit—a spirit being, and no longer a human being in any sense." Vol. 1, pp. 230-231.

He writes:

"Our Lord's being or soul was non-existent during the period of death. 'He poured out his soul unto death; he made his soul an offering for sin.' But his soul (being) was revived in resurrection, being granted a new spiritual body." Vol. 5, p. 362.

He defines soul as "sentient being, intelligence, the man himself, the being, or soul." Vol. 5, p. 308.

“Man’s superiority over the beast, according to the account given in Genesis, consists not in his having a different kind of breath or spirit, but in his having a higher form, a superior body, a finer organism—endowed with a brain organism which enables him to reason upon planes far above and beyond the intelligence of the lower animals of the brute creation.” Vol. 5, p. 310.

He teaches that our Lord Jesus “is no longer a man but a spirit being, whom no man hath seen nor can see without a miracle.” Vol. 2, p. 131.

“Our Lord’s human body was, however, supernaturally removed from the tomb; because had it remained there it would have been an insurmountable obstacle to the faith of the disciples, who were not yet instructed in spiritual things—for the spirit was not yet given.” (John 7:39). We know nothing about what became of it, except that it did not decay or corrupt. (Acts 2:27, 31). Whether it was dissolved into gasses or whether it is still preserved somewhere as the grand memorial of God’s love, of Christ’s obedience and of our redemption, no one knows.” Vol. 2, p. 129.

“Neither was Jesus a combination of two natures, human and spiritual. The blending of two natures produces neither the one nor the other, but an imperfect, hybrid thing, which is obnoxious to the divine arrangement. When Jesus was in the flesh he was a perfect human being; previous to that time he was a perfect spiritual being; and since his resurrection he is a perfect spiritual being of the highest or divine order. It was not until the time of his consecration even unto death, as typified in his baptism—at thirty years of age (manhood, according to the law, and therefore the right time to consecrate himself as a man)—that he received the earnest of his inheritance, divine nature. (Matt. 3:16, 17). The human nature had to be *consecrated to death* before he could receive even the pledge of the divine nature.

And not until that consecration was actually carried out and he had actually sacrificed the human nature, even unto death, did our Lord Jesus become a full partaker of the divine nature. After becoming a man he became obedient unto death; *wherefore*, God hath highly exalted him to the divine nature. (Phil 2:8, 9). If this Scripture is true, it follows that he was not exalted to the divine nature until the human nature was actually sacrificed—dead.”

“Thus we see that in Jesus there was no mixture of natures, but that twice he experienced a change of nature, first from spiritual to human; afterward from human to the highest order of spiritual nature, the divine; and in each case the one was given up for the other.” Vol. I., pp. 179-180.

Russell teaches also an inclusive Christ, or an extended Christ: that “Christ includes all anointed of the Spirit” (Vol. 1, p. 85); that “the Christ (the Anointed) is not one member but many.” Vol. 1, p. 82.

“The great work before this glorious anointed company—the Christ—necessitates their exaltation to the divine nature; no other than divine power could accomplish it. Theirs is a work pertaining not only to this world, but to all things in heaven and earth—among spiritual as well as among human beings.” Vol. 1, pp. 289, 290.

Russell *thus* teaches: (1) That Christ before his advent was not God, but a created angel. (2) That when he was in the earth he was neither God, nor a spirit of any order of being, but a human being, body with the *spirit of life*, or breath of life, in it. (3) That his atonement was exclusively human, a mere man’s. (4) That since his resurrection—really creation with a consciousness precisely like that with which Jesus passed into non-existence—he is a God—a *made God*. (5) That Jesus’ body was not raised from the dead. (6) That his soul became non-existent and must continue so forever.

The orthodox Christology which Russell either misconceives, or intentionally misrepresents, is briefly set forth in the answer to question 21 of the Westminster Shorter Catechism: "The only Redeemer of God's elect is the Lord Jesus Christ, who being the eternal Son of God, became man, and so was and continued to be God and man in two distinct natures and one person forever."

The bare statement of Russell's Christology as has been done above, first in his own words, and then, in more compact form, in our words, should be enough to kill it. The indulgent hearer will, however, it is hoped, pardon a shot or two at these positions of Russell.

(1) John 1:1 says, "The word was God." Reverent and real scholarship says of this passage, "The predicate (God) stands emphatically first, as in 4:24. It is necessarily without the article *Theos*, not *ho Theos*, inasmuch as it describes the nature of the Word and does not identify His Person. It would be pure Sabellianism to say "the word was *ho Theos*." No idea of inferiority of nature is suggested by the form of expression which simply affirms the true deity of the Word," (*Cannon Westcott, following the great current of thoughtful and learned Bible students of all the ages*). Three majestic truths are set forth in this passage: (a) The eternity of the Word. In beginning (*without* the article) *was* (not came into existence) the Word. Timeless existence is predicated of him. (b) The eternal *personal existence* is set forth. He was with God. By the Word all things were created and enlightened. (c) His deity is taught. "And the Word was God."

(2) If Christ was an honest man, he was also more than man—was God—when on earth. For he said, "It is written, 'Thou shalt worship the Lord, thy God, and him only shalt thou serve,' and yet he said, 'the Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgment unto the Son, that all men

should honour the Son even as they honour the Father.' He said, "Come unto me all ye that labor and are heavy laden and I will give you rest." How could a mere man so speak without sheer impiety? How, as a mere man, could he make himself the very object of supreme worship in the Lord's Supper, saying, "This do in remembrance of me?" The like argument might be made from many passages of Scripture. Truly, the attributes, works and worship predicated of Christ in the Scriptures represent him to be very God of very God, as well as man.

In denying that Jesus Christ is the eternally generated Son of God, who took a perfect human nature into union with himself, that he was at once the Son of God and the Son of Man, Russellism accuses Christ of falsehood and treason against the Most High; and brings him before man as the worst fraud, hypocrite and deceiver of the world's history down to the time of Mrs. Eddy. For he set himself up to be the God of the Universe.

(3) If he was a mere creature he could have no imputable obedience, active or passive; and could work out no redemption. The Scriptures say, "God sent forth from himself his Son, born of a woman born under the law, to redeem them that were under the law," Gal. 4:4, 5. This Scripture cannot be true if Russellism be true. Again, if he was a mere creature, how could Paul say, "In him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily." Col. 2:9. How could we explain Isaiah 9:6, "His name shall be called wonderful, counselor, the mighty God?"

(4) The Scriptures teach *not* that the Son is a made God, but that being in the form of God, he humbled himself for man's salvation; and hath, in consequence, been given *Mediatorial* lordship, Phil. 2:6-11. "The form of a thing is the mode in which it reveals itself; and that is determined by its nature." Chrysostom said: "It is not possible to be



of one essence and to have the form of another." He was "God over all blessed forever." Rom. 9:5. See here "Fundamentals," Vol. VII., pp. 109-110.

(5) The Scriptures teach that the body of Jesus was raised from the dead. "Reach hither thy finger, and behold my hands; and reach hither thy hand and thrust it into my side; and be not faithless but believing." See also John 20:24-28; Luke 24:39, etc. Shall we believe Christ, or C. T. Russell? Christ or the seller of miracle wheat at \$60.00 a bushel? In denying the bodily resurrection of Christ, Russellism reached a pitch of extreme audacity and falsehood. The doctrine of the resurrection is basal to Christianity. If Christ be not risen then Christians are of all men in a most pitiable and deceived condition. The lie invented by the chief priests that his disciples stole his body away during the night while the soldiers slept is not so shocking as this baseless speculation. Baseless it is. God had predicted His resurrection a thousand years before it occurred (Ps. 16:9; Acts 2:26-28). The gospel proof of the resurrection is bomb-proof. It was testified to by a large body of disciples, plain, competent, capable men who had ample opportunity to ascertain its reality, and were of honesty undoubted which assures us that they testified to fact as they saw it. (See "Fundamentals" VII., pp. 115-116). In his efforts to interpret away the Scriptural teaching as to Christ's resurrection, Russell ignores the fact that the Lord's resurrection body, while retaining its identity, was a spiritual body (I. Cor. 15:44), perfectly adapted to the Spirit, and not under the sway of natural laws which govern our ordinary bodies.

(6) Russell teaches that Jesus Christ passed into non-existence on Golgotha. Christ said to the repenting thief, "This day shalt thou be with me in paradise." If their personalities became non-existent at death, they could not

be together, for they were not. Who was right? Jesus or the man who said under oath, in the course of the same hour, that he knew the Greek language and that he was not familiar with it, and who appeared devoid of ability to name the letters of the Greek alphabet, on page 447, of Westcott and Hort's Greek Testament, when asked to do it in court? More, the Christ, which now is, according to Russellism, is a brand new one. The other gone forever. He was annihilated.

(7) Our Lord has two natures and not one as Russellism affirms. We read in John 1:14, "And the Word became flesh and dwelt among us (and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father), full of grace and truth. Notice: (a) The Word became flesh, he did not cease to be God in doing so. He was not changed into a man, a mere man. (b) He did not cease to be the Word, "He dwelt among us." The pronoun *He* has the Word for its antecedent. (c) The term "dwelt," literally is *tabernacled*, an allusion to the tabernacle of the Wilderness. God said, "And let them make me a sanctuary that I may dwell among them." Compare I John 1:1-3, where John summonses the three most trustworthy of our senses, *hearing, sight and touch*, to bear witness to the reality and presence of the Word of life, as dwelling among us.

See also John 16:28. "I came forth from the Father, and am come into the world: Again I leave the world and go unto my Father," which teaches eternal *son-ship, sojourn in the world, return to the Father*, of Jesus Christ.

See also I Tim. 3:16: "God was manifested in the flesh, justified in the Spirit, seen of angels, believed on in the world, received up into glory."

(8) The doctrine of the extended Christ is a diabolical abolition of the distinction between Christ and ourselves as generic.

Russell's Christology is an impious jumble, somewhat akin to unitarianism, more akin to Arianism, but much less worthy of respect than either and supported by an interpretation of Scripture wholly arbitrary—a reading into Scripture of notions foreign to it, that he may fool the people.

5. *Russell's teaching concerning the Holy Spirit.*

He says:

"This subject of the Holy Spirit, its office and operation, has been grievously misunderstood by many of the Lord's people for centuries: and only in the light of the rising Sun of Righteousness—in the light of the *parousia* of the Son of Man—is this subject becoming thoroughly clear and reasonable, as it evidently was to the early Church, and in harmony with all the various Scriptural testimonies pertaining to it. . . .

"There is consistency in the Scripture teaching that the Father and the Son are in full harmony and *oneness* of purpose and operation, as we have just seen. And equally consistent is the Scripture teaching respecting the Holy Spirit—that it is not another God, but the spirit influence or power exercised by the one God, our Father, and by his only Begotten Son—in absolute oneness, therefore, with both of these, who also are *at one* or in full accord. But how different is this unity of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit, from that held and taught under the name of Trinitarian doctrine, which in the language of the Catechism (Questions 5 and 6), declares: "There are three persons in the one God, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost: These three are one God, the same in substance, equal in power and glory." This view suited well 'the dark ages' which it helped to produce. The period in which mysteries were worshipped instead of unravelled, found a most choice one in this theory, which is as unscriptural as it is unreasonable. How could the *three* be *one person*, in substance?

And if 'one in substance,' how could they be equal? Does not every intelligent person know that if God is *one* in person, he cannot be three? and that if *three* in person there can be only one sense in which the three could be *one*, and that not in person but in purpose, in mind, in will, in co-operation? Verily, if it were not for the fact that this trinitarian nonsense was drilled into us from our earliest infancy, and the fact that it is soberly taught in Theological Seminaries by gray haired professors, in many other ways apparently wise, nobody would give it a moment's consideration." Vol. 5, pp. 165-166.

"It is impossible to harmonize these various statements" (The Holy Spirit of God, etc.), with the *ordinary idea* of a third God." Vol. 5, p. 168.

"In the light of the Scripture we may understand the Holy Spirit to mean:

(a) God's power exercised in any manner, but always according to lines of justice and love, and hence always a holy power.

(b) This power may be an energy of life, a physically creative power, or a power of thought, creating and inspiring thoughts and words, or a quickening life-giving power, as it was manifested in the resurrection of our Lord, and will again be manifested in the resurrection of the Church, his body.

(c) "The begetting or transforming power or influence of the knowledge of the Truth." Vol. 5, p. 183.

"It would be strange indeed if one member of a co-equal Trinity of equal gods referred to another as able and willing to give the third as earthly parents are to give bread, fish and eggs to their children." Vol. 5, p. 224.

In these passages Russell betrays anew his misconception of, or his caricaturing, of the doctrine of the trinity. He speaks as if Trinitarians were Tritheists—as if they held

that the several persons of the Godhead were related as three individual men are related, as if they were three individual beings, with substance the same in kind. Whereas the Trinitarian holds that the one substance of the deity exists in a three-fold mode—which modes are more nearly like that of personality in man than anything else with which man has to compare them. Hear the clear statement: “There are three persons in the Godhead, the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost, and these three are one God, the same in substance, equal in power and glory.”

That the Holy Spirit is represented as personal, as distinguished from the Father and the Son, and as divine, is the clear teaching of the word. The Scriptures say that the Holy Ghost “teaches” and “reveals,” John 14:26; I Cor. 2:13; John 15:25, 26; I Tim. 4:1; that He searches the decrees of God, I Cor. 2:10; that He calls to special work in the Church, to special work in the ministry, Acts 13:2; that he distributes gifts as He will, I Cor. 12:10; and exercises many other personal agencies; that He exercises the active feelings of a person, Eph. 4:30. Scripture distinguishes Him alike from Father and Son and represents Him as sharing in honors and acts undoubtedly personal to them, Matt. 28:19; 2 Cor. 13:14. *Pneuma* though neuter, is construed with a masculine pronoun, John 16:3. He is represented as lied to, and therefore as personal, Acts 5:3. These are but a few of the indications of his personality. They suffice.

His Divinity is so clearly set forth that Russell does not question that, only endeavoring to show that he is a Divine influence.

The subordination of the Holy Ghost as well as that of the Son is evidently that of economy. The three modes of the divine existence—three persons—are to be treated each with the same honor. They are therefore equal in honor,

though subordinating themselves in a given order in the outworking and application of redemption.

2d. *The plan of God.*

Russell teaches that God planned three great dispensations: The first "lasting from man's creation to the flood, 1656 years; the second, from the flood to the commencement of the millennial reign of Christ, at his second advent, 4344;\* and the third, or "Dispensation of the Fulness of Times," lasting from the beginning of Christ's reign for 'ages to come'." Vol. 1, p. 219.

He teaches that, in each of these three dispensations, "God's plan with reference to men has a distinct and separate outline;" that "the dispensation before the flood was under the supervision and special ministration of angels, who were permitted to try what they could do to recover the fallen and degenerate race." Vol. 1, p. 220. That during the second dispensation, 'the present evil world,' up to 1874, man was permitted to try governing himself; but by reason of the fall he was under the control of Satan, the "prince of this world;" that "this dispensation was to end in the greatest time of trouble the world ever saw;" that this dispensation was composed of three distinct ages; the age of the patriarchs from the flood to the death of Jacob; the Jewish age, and the Gospel age; that in this gospel age, "We had the 'royal priesthood,' composed of all those who offered themselves to God," living sacrifices, 'holy and acceptable through Jesus Christ," that during this period "the body of Christ was called out of the world, and shown . . . the exceeding great and precious promises whereby (by obedience to the call and its requirements) they might become partakers of the divine nature." Vol. 1, pp. 221-22. That 'the third great dispensation is to be composed of many ages,' that the first of these is the Millennial age; that "it is the

---

\*This dispensation ended in 1874.

thousand years during which Christ will reign over and thereby bless all the families of the earth, accomplishing the restitution of all things spoken by the mouth of all the holy prophets. During that age, sin and death shall be forever blotted out." Vol. 1, p. 222.

"The ages to come following the great reconstruction period, are to be ages of perfection, blessedness and happiness, regarding the work of which the Scriptures are silent." Vol. 1, p. 223.

"Each of these dispensations has its distinct seasons for the beginning and development of its work, and each ends with a harvest manifesting its fruits. The harvest at the close of the Jewish age was a period of forty years, lasting from the beginning of Jesus' ministry. . . . A. D. 29, until the destruction of Jerusalem, A. D. 70. Vol. 1, p. 223.

"A harvest constitutes the closing period of the Gospel age also, during which there is again a lapping of the two ages—the Gospel age ending, and the Restitution or Millennial age beginning. The Gospel age closes by stages, as did its pattern or 'shadow,' the Jewish age. As then, the first seven years of the harvest were devoted in a special sense to a work in and for Israel after the flesh, and were years of favor, so here we find a similar seven years indicated as having the same bearing upon the Gospel Church, to be followed by a period of trouble (fire) upon the world as a punishment for wickedness, and a preparation for the reign of righteousness." Vol. I, p. 224.

He teaches that God planned that during the Jewish age some persons might avail themselves of God's overtures of mercy and win for themselves, the title to recreation in the millennial age, as perfect human beings; that God planned that a few persons in the Gospel age, through faith and the sacrifice of their human lives, might win the title to a call into spiritual existence and elevation to the Divine nature

in the millennial age; that in the Millennial age all the hosts of those who have died shall be "resurrected" (created) and given a trial full and sufficient, when, if they choose to serve Christ, they shall be made perfect with the perfection with which Adam started. (See Vol. 2.)

He says, "Let us not be misunderstood. We have heretofore shown that God's plan does not extend to the converting of the world during the Gospel Age. He did not intend to do so, but merely designed the selection and trial of the Church now, and the blessing of the world through the Church, the Christ, in an age to follow this. We do not contradict this when we say that the Elijah (Christ in the flesh), has tried to convert the world and failed . . . for though God knew and foretold that our mission to the world would be largely a failure, except in selecting of a choice little flock, yet knowing that the effort would react favorably upon ourselves, his commission to us through our Lord Jesus Christ was to try to convert the world, when he said, 'Go ye into all the world and preach the good tidings to every creature.'" Vol. 2, p. 252.

He says with regard to election and free grace:

"If the distinctive features of the epochs and dispensations outlined in a preceeding chapter be kept in mind, and all the passages relating to election and free grace be examined and located, it will be found that all those which treat of election apply to the present. (Gospel and past ages, while those which teach Free Grace are fully applicable to the next age."

"Since the fall of man into sin, to the present time, certain of God's favors have been restricted to specify individuals, nations and classes, while in the next age all the world will be invited to share the favors then offered, then made known to all, and whosoever will may come and drink at life's fountain freely." Vol. 1, pp. 96, 97.



“That the Christian Church, the body of Christ, is an exception to God’s general plan for mankind, is evident from the statement that its selection was determined in the divine plan before the foundation of the world (Eph. 1:4, 5), at which time God not only foresaw the fall of the race into sin, but also predetermined the justification, the sanctification and the glorification of this class, which during the Gospel age, he has been calling out of the world to be conformed to the image of his Son, to be partakers of the divine nature and to be fellow heirs with Jesus Christ of the Millennial Kingdom for the establishment of universal righteousness and peace.”

“This shows that the election, or choice, of the Church was a pre-determined thing on God’s part: but mark, it is not an unconditional election of the *individual members* of the Church. Before the foundation of the world God determined that such a company should be selected for such a purpose within a specific time—the Gospel Age. While we cannot doubt that God could have foreseen the action of each individual member of the Church, and could have foreknown just who would be worthy and therefore constitute the members of that ‘little flock,’ yet this is not the way in which God’s word presents the doctrine of election. It was not the thought of an individual predestination which the Apostles sought to inculcate, but that a *class* was predestined in God’s purpose to fill the honorable position, the selection of which would be upon conditions of severe trials of faith and obedience and the sacrifice of earthly privileges even unto death. Thus by an individual trial, and by individually ‘overcoming’ the individual members of the *pre-determined class* are being chosen or accepted into all blessings and benefits predetermined of God for this class.”

“In selecting the little flock, God makes a very general call—many are called.” . . . “But even of those who

hear and come, all are not worthy. Wedding garments are provided, but some will not wear them, and must be rejected; and of those who do put on the robes of justification, and who receive the honor of being begotten to a new nature, some fail to make their calling and election sure by faithfulness to their covenant." (Vol. 1, pp. 193-195).

According to this plan, Jesus, Russell teaches, was to become present (spiritually) October, 1874; "Israel after the Spirit" was to obtain from the death of Jesus till 1878; her period of favor was thus to cover 1845 years; the nominal house of Sons, or the Christian Church, was then to be spewed out, in A. D., 1878; she was to be thirty-seven years in falling, and was to fall in 1915, the end of an age of harvest of 40 years—a harvest extending from the year 1874 to the end of 1914, or to 1915. Vol. 2, pp. 246, 247.

Here, again, the statement of this *plan* of the modes of the dispensation, of how God related himself to the world in the several ages, should be enough to kill it. But, *ex abundantia* a few weaknesses may be pointed out.

1st. Russell's teaching that, in the first dispensation, God let the angels see what they could do toward man's recovery, is a vain dream of his. The Scriptures which he cites in support of this teaching are Job 38:7, which tells of the joy of the angels at the creation of the lower universe; and Heb. 2:5, "Unto the angels hath he not put in subjection the world to come." If from the assertion, that God hath not subjected the world to come to angels, there be a legitimate inference that he hath subjected a certain other world to angels, it is that he hath subjected the world of the Jewish age to angels. For in the context we are taught that he had promulgated the law through them; and in the context it is precisely a contrast between the Mosaic dispensation and the Christian dispensation that the Apostle means, and not a contrast between the Antediluvian and later ages.

2d. Russell's teaching that God does not intend the conversion of the world in the Gospel age—that he intends that in the Millennial age; that Christ commissioned the Church not to convert world in the Gospel age—but to *try* to convert it in that age, is supported by the kind of *eisegesis* that permits and exacts the gratuitous interpolation of the word *try* into the very language of the great commission. In that commission Christ said: "Go ye, therefore, and *make disciples* of all nations;" and, to guarantee success in that effort, Christ, to whom all authority in heaven and earth had been given, added, "Lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world." It is supported also by an *eisegesis* that turns Christ's visible coming into an *invisible* coming; and by an *eisegesis* which represents Christ as having thus come in 1874, as having assumed the power and title of king in 1878, and as having accomplished utterly the destruction of the nominal Christian Church in the next "thirty-seven years," or in 1915. Vol. 2, p. 247.

3d. Russell's teaching that God has planned to restore, in the Millennial age, all men who have not in previous ages accepted Christ, to the perfection of nature with which Adam was naturally endowed, is supported with similar *eisegesis*, and with utter disregard both of God's sanity and of the havoc such teaching, if believed, would make of men's morals: No sane ruler, wishing his righteous laws obeyed, would advertise to his subjects that the only penalty of sin would be temporary annihilation, coupled with a recall into existence and a new period of probation vastly more favorable. No righteous ruler would hold such a prospect out before sinful men; and so encourage universal license in a race set in sin. But, more, the Bible teaches nothing of a salvation which shall result in the status of Adamic perfection. It teaches only of a salvation to the life which is life—heirship with Christ to eternal glory.

4th. Russell minimizes the number of the saved in the Gospel age, by stressing isolated texts. It is with him always the "little flock" that is saved. Now, the Bible does not teach that every man is to be saved, but it does teach that a great multitude that no man can number is to be saved; that a number so vast as to justify our Lord in saying, "And I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto me."

5th. Russell's teaching that there is a future probation for all who do not accept Christ in the Gospel age is without Biblical warrant, or any warrant in reason. He has no more evidence from either source than the average assessor of future probation, which in the face of Scripture teaching is *nil*. In 2 Cor. 5:10, for example, "For we must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ; that every one may receive the things done in the body, according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad," we are taught that in the great award the things done here and now are determinative of our future. In 2 Cor. 6:2, "Now is the day of salvation; behold now (in the Gospel Age), is the day of salvation," the same truth is reiterated. So also in Matt. 28:19, 20, in connection with Matt 24:3, 6, 14. Many other passages show that the time of salvation is now, till the end of the world—till Christ's second coming.

6th. Russell's teaching that election is not of individuals but of classes, is a form of Pelagianism; and is refuted by the usual arguments against Pelagianism, e. g., by the fact that Scriptural language shows that individuals not classes possessing given characteristics were elected to salvation. See Rom. 8:29, ff., *et passim*.

In identifying election with "acceptance into all blessings and benefits predetermined of God for this class," the baldness of his Pelagianism appears.

7th. In teaching the doctrine of falling from justification, Russell follows the Pelagian error.

8th. The facts of history as well as the teachings of Scripture show to be false the dates which Russell fixes upon for the coming of Christ and Christ's spewing out the Church and the utter collapse of the Church.

### 3d. *Russell's Doctrine of Creation.*

He seems to reduce creation to formation; at least, to be unwilling to teach *de nihilo* creation. He says, "The wise will not attempt to guess that which God has not revealed respecting how he previously gathered together earth's atoms." Vol. 6, p. 23. He teaches that a personal God framed "the universe, man excepted, out of these atoms, probably by a method of evolution. He teaches that "man was a direct and perfect creation" (Vol. 1, p. 32); but by this creation he seems to mean nothing more than formation of his body out of earthy particles and vivifying it with the breath of life, i. e., with that vitality (as he explains), that man shares along with the lower animals.

Here the author intermingles senile dreams with nonsense, which he reads into the word of God in order to support his theory.

4th. Russell's doctrine of providence resembles as far as his peculiar crotchets allow, the Semi-Pelagian view, and therefore, calls for no specific representation or refutation, that having been done in the regular course in theology.

## II. *Russell's Anthropology; or Doctrine of Man's Origin, Constitution, Soul, Original Moral Character, Fall, Sin, Penalty, Destiny.*

1. As has just been shown, Russell teaches that God created (formed) man by an immediate exertion of his own power, as the crown of material creation.

2. He teaches that man consists of body and the spirit of life; that man's body is the most perfect of animal organisms; and that the spirit is simply vital, animal energy. Thus he says:

"Man's superiority over the beast, according to the account given in Genesis, consists not in his having a different kind of breath or spirit, but in his having a higher form, a superior body, a finer organism—endowed with a brain organism which enables him to reason upon planes far above and beyond the intelligence of the lower animals, the brute creation. We find that in these respects man was created a fleshly likeness of his Creator, who is a Spirit being." Vol. 5, p. 310.

"But as we have found, and as all men are witnesses, each has a different bodily organism which gives to each his different characteristics, and which alone constitutes one higher and the other lower in the scale of intelligence." Vol. 5, p. 327.

In support of these teachings, he quotes amongst other passage, Eccles. 3:21, "Who knoweth the spirit of man whether it goeth upward?" He endeavors to break the force of Eccles. 12:7, "The dust returneth to the earth as it was, and the spirit returneth to God who gave it," by making spirit to mean "the privilege of living the power or permission of living." But, in the 5th verse, the writer says, "because man goeth to his everlasting home." How can man be said to go to his everlasting home, if his body goes back to the dust and his spirit is nothing but "permission to live." In that case man is not. He has no home. He has become non-existent.

3. He teaches that the soul of man is a resultant quality or condition from the injection of spirit (vital energy) into the body; that a soul is a sentient being. He says:

"Examining this question from the Bible standpoint, we will find that man has a body and has a spirit ('vital force,') but *is* a soul. Science concurs with the Scriptures in this. Indeed, one of the sciences, Phrenology, undertakes to treat the skulls and lower animals as indexes and to read there-

from the natural traits and characteristics of the owners." . . .

"The word 'soul' as found in the Scriptures, signifies *sentient being*; that is a being possessed of powers of sense, sense-perception. With minds freed from prejudice, let us go with this definition to the Genesis account of man's creation, and note that (1) the organism, or body, was formed; (2) 'the *spirit of life*,' 'called Breath of life,' was communicated, (3) *living soul*, or *sentient being* resulted. This is very simple and easily understood. It shows that the body is not the soul, nor is the spirit or breath of life the soul; but that when these two were united, the resultant quality, or condition, was living man, living being—a living soul, possessed of perceptive powers." Vol. 5, pp. 322-323.

Over against this: (1) Set the words of our Lord. "Fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul; but rather fear him, which is able to destroy both soul and body in hell." Matt. 10:28. Such is the common representation in Scriptures. The body and soul are set forth as distinct substances; Christ also represents Dives and Lazarus as living in the unseen world. Their bodies were in the grave. (2) There is another class of passages which equally refutes this point in Russellism. These passages represent the body as a garment which is to be laid aside—a house in which the soul dwells. Peter says that he "must shortly put off this tabernacle." Paul says, "If our earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved, we have a building of God," 2 Cor. 5:1-9; and in the same connection he speaks of being unclothed and clothed upon with our house which is from heaven.

While soul is often used in Scripture with special reference to man's sensuous and perceptive faculties, and spirit is often used with special reference to his higher faculties, the words are often used as equivalent and of a substance

and not of a mere vital energy, albeit the substance is qualified with vital energy, of a kind.

4. Russell teaches that man was good—morally good—as he came originally from the hands of God. He apparently holds a position as close to the Wesleyan Arminians as his crochets will allow on this point.

5. With regard to the Fall, Russell teaches the fact of it as well as the morally excellent character of Adam prior to the fall, in the following words:

“Mental and physical perfection, under the conditions presented in the divine account of the creation, clearly and positively imply moral perfection; for we are to remember that, according to the Scriptures, moral obliquity and consequent degradation had not set in. Nor is it supposable that man, without moral elements to his mental development, would be described in the Scriptures as a “very good” man, or as an image of his Creator.” . . .

“The death sentence, or ‘curse,’ pronounced against Adam, viz.: ‘Dying thou shalt die’ (Gen. 2:17, margin), was not merely against his muscles and physical frame—it included the entire man, the mental as well as the physical; and this also included the moral qualities, because they are a part of the mental. It is in full confirmation of this that we see today that man is a fallen being in every sense of the word. Physically he is degenerated, and his average of life has fallen, under most favorable conditions, to thirty-three years; mentally and morally we also see that he is very deficient, yet possessing organs capable of much higher development than his short life will permit.” Vol. 5, p. 407.

To one who is sufficiently superficial this quotation may appear to be a simple, pious statement of the teaching of the Scriptures on the subject; but let him begin to think, and it will appear unworthy of respect. What right has Russell to contrast in these words the physical and the



mental, since he teaches that man consists simply of matter organized in given ways and vital, animal energy. For that is physical too, only physical according to Russell.

6. Russell falsely resolves sin into that which produces unhappiness. Thus he says: "We distinguish these opposite principles of *right* and *wrong* by their effects when put into action. That principle which, when active, is beneficial and productive of ultimate order, harmony and happiness we call a right principle; and the opposite, which is productive of discord, unhappiness and destruction, we call a wrong principle. The results of these principles in action we call *good and evil*, and the intelligent being, capable of discerning the right principle from the wrong, and voluntarily governed by the one or the other, we call virtuous or sinful." Vol. 1, pp. 118, 119.

A peculiarity of his doctrine of sin is his representing it as an "asset" for all those who are not received into the "little flock." He tells us that in the millennium all those who have not been received into this body shall be called into existence ("resurrected") and given a new trial; whereupon he says: "The experience with evil, contrasted with the experience with good, which will come to each during the trial of the coming age, will constitute the advantage by reason of which the results of the second trial will differ so widely from the results of the first." Vol. 1, p. 151.

Teach this doctrine to men and women—of unrenewed hearts—teach them that sin is a "valuable asset"—no matter what sort of sin—teach this doctrine along with Russell's doctrine that death is going into non-existence—that it involves the saint and the sinner in exactly the same penalty, and you will incite those so taught toward the grossest wickedness.

7. Of the penalty of sin, Russell writes:

"It should be remembered, however, that it is not the pain

and suffering in dying, but death—the extinction of life—in which dying culminates, that is the penalty of sin. The suffering is only incidental to it, and the penalty falls on many with but little or no suffering. . . . In the penalty pronounced there was no intimation of release. (Gen. 2:17). Vol. 1, p. 154.

“What, then, dies? We answer that it is the soul that dies—the sentient being ceases. Let us remember that the sentient being was produced by the union of the breath, or spirit of life, with an organism, and that the dissolution, or separation, of these two causes the cessation of being the soul—death. That this is true of the lower animals, none would for a moment question; but is it not equally true of man, the highest animal, created in the intellectual image and moral likeness of God?” Vol. 5, p. 341.

Remark:

This is utterly unbiblical. We read in that book that Abraham “died in a good old age . . . and was gathered to his father.” A little later we read that his sons “buried him in the cave of Machpelah. Gen. 25:8, 9. His people were not buried “in the cave of Machpelah; he while buried there, was gathered unto his fathers.” The meaning must be that he was buried as to his body in Machpelah and gathered as to his soul to his fathers. His soul survived the shock of death. So Samuel is represented as surviving the shock of death. He came up at the interview of Saul with the witch of Endor. I Sam. 29:15.

Our Lord Jesus Christ represents Abraham, a dead beggar, Lazarus, and a rich man as all existing in Hades—Abraham and Lazarus as in one portion of Hades and Dives as in another portion. Our Lord teaches of the rich man that he survived and suffered, of Abraham and Lazarus, that they survived and were happy.

The Apostle John, saw, Rev. 6., the souls of multitudes

who had been beheaded in the great transgression, existing and full of activity. See also 2 Cor. 5:1-9; Phil. 1:23.

In addition, the absolute unity and indivisibility of the substance of the soul to which a sound philosophy points would seem to show that there can be no such thing as the extinction of the soul.

Russell's teaching that suffering is no part of the penalty due to sin is shown to be false by the language of the curse pronounced up the first pair. Gen. 3:16-19. The ills of the sinner's life are but stages in his dying. Russell's teaching that an organism may not have life, is contrary to the fact. It is always a living thing. It is growth regulated by a vital principle. Let that principle depart and the remains begin to fall to pieces.

8. Russell teaches of man's destiny as follows:

"Paul says that the first man (who was a sample of what the race will be when perfect) was of the earth, earthy; and his posterity, with the exception of the Gospel Church, will in the resurrection, still be earthy, human, adapted to the earth (1. Cor. 15:38, 44.) Vol. 1, p. 191.

"While Jesus as a man was an illustration of perfect human nature, to which the mass of mankind will be restored, yet since his resurrection he is the illustration of the glorious divine nature, which the overcoming Church will, at the resurrection, share with him.

"Because the present age is devoted mainly to the development of this class which is offered a change of nature, and because the apostolic epistles are devoted to the instruction of this "little flock", it should not be inferred that God's plans end with the completion of this chosen company. Nor, on the other hand, should we go to the opposite extreme, and suppose the promises of the divine nature, spiritual promises, etc., made to these, are God's design for all mankind. To these are the "exceeding great and precious

promises", over and above the precious promises made to all mankind. To rightly divide the word of truth, we should observe that the Scriptures recognize the perfection of the divine nature in the "little flock" and the perfection of the human nature in the restored world, as two separate things." Vol. 1. p. 180. Cf. p. 191.

"The conditions on which the Church may be exalted with her lord to the divine nature (2 Pet. 1:4), are precisely the same as the conditions on which he received it, even by following in his footprints (1 Pet. 2:21), presenting herself a living sacrifice, as he did, and then faithfully carrying out that consecration even until the sacrifice terminates in death. This change of nature from human to divine is given as a reward to those who, within the Gospel age, sacrifice the *human nature*, as did our Lord, with all its interests, hopes and aims, present and future—even unto death. In the resurrection such will awake, not to share with the rest of mankind in the blessed restoration to human perfection and all its accompanying blessings, but to share the likeness and glory and joy of the Lord, as partakers with him of the divine nature." Vol. 1, 195.

Thus, according to Russell, here, two great classes of mankind are destined to two respective stages of salvation: (1) "the little flock", to elevation to the divine nature; (2) The great body of mankind to Adamic perfection. There is still a third class, a small class, the members of which will not avail themselves of salvation through Christ either in the Gospel age, or in the Millennium.

In regard to Russell's teaching on this subject of the destiny of men, we remark:

1st. He uses the same sort of *eisegesis* in support of it for which he is remarkable in all his teaching. Take, for example, his dealing with 1. Cor., 15:38, 44. He refers to it in support of his doctrine that the major part of Adam's

race will be, in th resurrection, "earthly, human, adapted to the earth". Now, verse 38, "God giveth it a body as it hath pleased him, and to every seed his own body," simply teaches that God gives to all products of the earth each its own form" and "that therefore, at the resurrection He may give to man's body the form He pleases to give it. One cannot infer from looking at a seed what form the plant is to have. No more can he infer the form of the resurrection body from our present body." Verse 44, "It is sown a natural body, it is raised a spiritual body", teaches that the resurrection body shall be a body, adapted to the spirit, and which from Paul's description we know to be incorruptible, glorious, powerful and adapted to the heavenly stage existence," teaches that just as certainly as we have bodies adapted to our present existence so certainly shall the saint have bodies adapted to their future existence. The passage does not support Russell's contention, at all. (See also 1. Cor. 15:48; Hodge *in loco*.)

2d. Russell gives no proof that Jesus, prior to his death, had the very kind of human nature in all its accidents to which the mass of mankind are to be elevated.

3d. Another radically false teaching of Russell's here is that some men—those who constitute the "little flock"—are to be elevated to the divine nature. The finite nature cannot be turned into the infinite nature. The created nature cannot be turned into the uncreated nature. Man cannot become the highest order of spirit. This is impossible even by Almighty power.

Russell misunderstands and vastly overworks 2 Pet. 1:4: "That ye may be partakers of the divine nature." The meaning is: That ye may grow into holiness as perfect for finite beings as that which belongs to God is for Him. (Cf. Heb. 12:10; but he chastens 'us for our profit that we might be partakers of his holiness'). The remaining clause in 2

Pet. 1:4, "having escaped the corruption that is in the world through lust," makes clear the fact, that the Apostle has in mind in the foregoing clause the getting back the likeness to God, whose image was lost through sin. It is an exchange of the quality of sin for the quality of holiness that Peter holds before his readers, not at all a change of the substantial nature—from the created to the uncreated—a thing impossible to be wrought by Divine power even.

III. *Russell's Soteriology: or His Teaching Concerning the Covenant Between the Father and the Son; the Nature of the Mediator, the Nature of his Sacrifice; the Results of His Sacrifice; Christ's Humiliation and Exaltation; Two Kinds of Salvation; Regeneration; Salvation by Works—Three Ways: Faith, Repentance, Justification; Sanctifications and Good Works.*

1. Russell, of course, can know nothing of a Covenant of Redemption between the persons of the trinity, since, as we have seen he teaches that there was no trinity of persons in the Godhead. He teaches that the God determined to ransom Adam's race through the angel Michael as ransomer, and that, accordingly, He turned Michael into a human being.

Russell says of the ransomer: "When he was made flesh, to be our Redeemer, it was not of compulsion, but as a voluntary matter, the result of his complete harmony with the Father, and his joyful acquiescence in carrying out every feature of the divine will—which he had learned to respect and love." Vol. 5, p. 84.

This twaddle not only gives us no eternal understanding and harmony of purpose between the Father and the Son as to redemption, but gives us only a creature redeemer—a redeemer incompetent to the work of redemption, as shall be brought out subsequently. If this contention that Christ is a mere creature could be made good, this would be a death blow to the doctrine of the atonement.

2. As to the nature of the Mediator, Russell teaches nothing of the unity of the divine and human natures in one personality in Christ. In Russell's view Christ is a pure spirit being "before the incarnation (so-called), a purely animal being of the human class during the period of his incarnation (so-called), and a pure "spirit being" of the highest or divine type after his "resurrection" and "elevation." Jesus of Nazareth, while on the earth, had no other nature than an animal nature. See quotations on page 5, of this paper.

But see for the annihilation of this twaddle such passages of Scripture as John 3:13, "No man hath ascended up to heaven, but he that came down from heaven, even the Son of Man, which is in heaven." Christ could only be in heaven, while on earth in virtue of his possession of the divine nature. See also remarks on p. 112, of this paper, in proof that Jesus Christ was God as well as man.

3. Russell teaches as to the nature of the sacrifice of our Lord: that "Jesus presented His perfect humanity a sacrifice, laying down all right and claim to future existence," (Vol. 1, p. 199); that "his human existence ended on the cross (Vol. 1, 230), that "our Lord's being or soul was non-existent during the period of death: "He poured out his soul unto death: He made his soul an offering for sin." Vol. 5, p. 362.

Russell teaches that God willed that Jesus should thus become non-existent, and that, therefore, it is right. He asks whether God "may not do what He will with His own."

In regard to this impiety, remark:

1st. If Christ became non-existent on the cross, then the Christ, in glory is not the same Christ at all. He could not rise again for he was not. The so-called Christ in glory, is a brand new being. It is purely arbitrary to regard him as in any way connected with the Christ on earth. In order

to a resurrection from the dead somewhat must remain in being after death. According to Russell, Jesus passed into non-existence. Then Christ "is not risen," and, according to Paul, if this be so, "ye are yet in your sins." But this by the way.

2d. It is more important to notice that Russell's doctrine on this subject flatly contradicts the Scriptures which teach that Christ was to be in paradise the very day of his death, not another being but he, the same, that subsequently he appeared to his disciples and identified himself as the very being who had been crucified, who bore the wound prints in hands and feet and side. Russell reduces sober and blessed history to a fraud.

4. Russell teaches as to the results of Christ's sacrifice: "Our Lord Jesus Christ, 'the man Christ Jesus,' himself unblemished, approved, and with a perfect seed or race in him, unborn, likewise untainted with sin, gave his *all* of human life and title as the full ransom price for Adam and the race or seed in him when sentenced. Having thus fully purchased the lives of Adam and his race, Christ offers to adopt as his seed, his children, all of Adam's race who will accept the terms of his new Covenant and thus by faith come into his family—the family of God—and receive everlasting life. Thus the Redeemer will see 'his seed' (as many of Adam's seed as will accept adoption upon his conditions), and prolong his days (resurrection to a higher than human plane, being granted him by the Father as a reward for his obedience), and all in the most unlikely way—by the sacrifice of life and posterity. And thus it is written: "As all in Adam die, even so all in Christ shall be made alive."

"The injury we received through Adam's fall (we suffered no injustice) is by God's favor, to be more than offset with favor through Christ; and all will sooner or later (in



God's due time), have a full opportunity to be restored to the same standing that Adam enjoyed before he sinned. Those who do not receive a full knowledge and, by faith, an enjoyment of this favor of God in the present time (and such are the great majority, including children and heathen), will assuredly have these privileges in the next age, or "world to come," the dispensation or age to follow the present. To this end, all that are in their graves . . . shall come forth." "As each one becomes aware of the ransom price given by our Lord Jesus, and of his subsequent privileges, he will be considered as again on trial, as Adam was; and again obedience will bring everlasting life, and disobedience everlasting death—the 'second death.' Perfect obedience without perfect ability to render it, will not be required of any. Under the New Covenant, the Church, during the Gospel age, have had the righteousness of Christ imputed to them by faith, to make up their unavoidable deficiencies through the weakness of the flesh; and this same grace will operate toward 'whoever will' of the world during the millennial age. Not until physical perfection is reached (which will be the privilege of all before the close of the millennial age), will absolute moral perfection be required. This new trial, the result of the ransom and the New Covenant, will differ from the trial in Eden, in that in it the acts of each one will affect only his own nature. Vol. 1, pp. 129, 130.

Thus Russell teaches that the satisfaction rendered by Jesus Christ (whom he represents as a mere man—the highest type of the animal kingdom), resulted in a new trial to the children of Adam individually and in a lowered demand for obedience on their part till they have perfect ability to render perfect obedience restored to them in the millennial age; that Christ in this work, not only sacrifices himself but a "race which is in him—sacrifices his "life and

posterity;" and that Adam's posterity because of their acquaintance with sin and the more lenient conditions of the second trial are much more likely to come through successfully.

Remark:

(1) That this doctrine involves the doctrine of salvation by works in a bald form. Through Christ a new opportunity to win salvation is offered and the conditions under which it may be won are made more favorable; but to get either of two salvations offered, a man must work it out himself.

(2) That his doctrine of a lowered demand for obedience to righteous law is dishonoring to God, who cannot demand less than perfect righteousness, from every moral creature, except at the cost of abdicating His throne of holiness.

(3) That to teach that one mere rational creature can atone for the guilt of another is stultifying, if God be just. The creature however holy and exalted is under obligation to give his utmost service to God on his own account. He can make satisfaction for the guilt of no other creature.

(4) His exegesis of "As all in Adam die, so, all in Christ," etc., is incorrect. Dr. Chas. Hodge says of this passage:

"That the word *all* in the latter part of this verse is to be restricted to all believers (or rather, to all people of Christ, as infants are included), is plain: 1. Because the word in both clauses is limited. It is the all who are in Adam that die; and the all who are in Christ who are made alive. As union with Christ is made the ground of the communication of life here spoken of, it can be extended only to those who are in him. But according to the constant representation of the Scriptures, none are in him but his own people. "If any man be in Christ, he is a new creature." 2. Cor. 5:17. 2. Because the verb *zoopoiatha* here found is never used of the wicked. Whenever employed in reference to the work of Christ it always means to communicate to them that life

of which he is the source, John 5:21, 6:63; Rom. 8:11; I Cor. 15:45; Gal. 3:21. The real meaning of the verse, therefore, is, 'As in Adam all die, so in Christ shall all be made partakers of a glorious and everlasting life.' Unless, therefore, the Bible teaches that all men are in Christ, and that all through him partake of eternal life, the passage must be restricted to his own people. 3. Because, although Paul elsewhere speaks of a general resurrection both of the just and of the unjust, Acts 24:15, yet, throughout this chapter he speaks only of the resurrection of the righteous. 4. Because, in the parallel passage in Rom. 5:12-21, the same limitation must be made. In verse 18 of that chapter, it is said, "As by the offence of one judgment came upon all men to condemnation; even so by the righteousness of one the free gift came upon all men to justification of life." That is, as for the offence of Adam, all men were condemned, so for the righteousness of Christ, all men are justified. The context and the analogy of Scripture require us to understand this to mean, as all who are in Adam are condemned, so all who are in Christ are justified. No historical Christian church has ever held that all men indiscriminately are justified. For whom God justifies them he also glorifies." Rom. 8:30." See *Hodge, Commentary on I Corinthians, I Cor. 15:22*.

5. Russell teaches concerning Christ's humiliation and exaltation, that it consists in his being turned from a high angelic spirit being into a human being, i. e., into the highest type of animal being, his living the human animal life, and his passing at the crucifixion into absolute non-existence, never as a man to live again; and that his exaltation consists in his being called into existence again as a spirit being and being "elevated" into the divine nature—the highest type of existence.

Quotations already adduced make this plain. Scriptures

already adduced also make it equally plain that this teaching conflicts with Scripture. They teach that *he* continued to exist and that his body was resurrected from the dead. Hear him say to the Apostles: "Behold my hands and my feet, that it is I myself: handle me and see; for a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye see me have." Luke 24:39, etc.

Common sense teaches also that Russellism at this point is nonsense. According to Russellism the finite is changed into the infinite—an impossibility as has been already pointed out.

6. Russell teaches four kinds of salvation—a salvation to opportunity to all, and a salvation of the "little flock" to the divine nature, and a salvation of certain Church members, justified but not sanctified to a spiritual but not divine nature, and the salvation of the great majority to Adamic perfection. Thus he says:

"We see, then, that the general salvation, which will come to every individual, consists of light from the true light, and an opportunity to choose life; and as the great majority of the race is in the tomb, it will be necessary to bring them from the grave, in order to testify to them the good tidings of a Savior; also that the special salvation which believers now enjoy in hope (Rom. 8:24); and the reality of which will, in the millennial age, be revealed also, to those who 'believe in that day,' is a full release from the thralldom of sin, and the corruption of death, into the glorious liberty of the children of God. But attainment to all these blessings will depend upon hearty compliance with the laws of Christ's Kingdom—the rapidity of the attainment of perfection indicating the degree of love for the King and for his law of love." Vol. 1, p. 107.

"This change of nature from human to divine is given as a reward to those who, within the Gospel age, sacrifice the *human nature*, as did our Lord, with all *its* interests, hopes

and aims, present and future—even unto death. In the resurrection such will awake, not to share with the rest of mankind in the blessed restitution to human perfection and all its accompanying blessings, but to share the likeness and glory and joy of the Lord, as partakers with him of the divine nature." Vol. 1, p. 196. Cf., also pp. 153 and 211.

Russell teaches that there are believers "who shrink from the death of the human will" but whom God still loves and will therefore bring "by the way of adversity and trouble to the perfect spiritual plane. But they will have lost the right to the throne of glory."

He endeavors to support his doctrine of these different types of salvation by an *eisegesis*. of such texts as I Tim. 2:10: "The Saviour of all men, especially of those that believe"; John 3:6, etc., and by the assertion that the only Scripture quoted to prove that this life is the only period of probation is Eccles. 11:3, "Where the tree falleth, there it shall lie."

Now this latter assertion is that of an ignoramus or a falsifier. "Behold, now is the accepted time; behold, now is the day of salvation (2 Cor. 6:2) is another text: "For we (men) must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ; that every one may receive the things done in his body, according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad" (2 Cor. 5:10), is another; and there are others and good ones; and if this be the only period of probation Russellism at this point has a broken neck.

Russell and the Lord Jesus Christ do not harmonize on the subject of whether there is a class of the saved who are not joint heirs with Jesus Christ. In Matt. 25:31 ff., Christ presents only two classes as obtaining after the judgment the saved and the lost—the heirs of eternal life and the "Kingdom," and the doomed to everlasting punishment. If there are two kinds of salvation of so diverse a nature, why

does Christ say nothing of the fact, why do the apostles say naught of it?

The texts from Timothy and John referred to above, teach indeed that in some sense Christ ransomed the world, that Christ died for the world, and has he not by his death staved off the world's doom, made the world happier, given many privileges to the world, died sufficiently for all the world? Yes; has he not wrought out redemption for all the world as far as by faith it will receive it, as Russell's creature Christ, his merely animal Christ, his good beast Christ could never have done? Is it blasphemous so to speak of Christ? But that is Russellism.

7. Russell teaches concerning the transformation of those who constitute the "little flock."

"The beginning and development of the new nature is likened to the beginning and development of human life. As in the one case there is a begetting and then a birth, so in the other. The saints are said to be begotten of God through the truth. That is, they receive the first impulse in the divine life from God through his Word. When having been justified freely by faith in the ransom, they hear the call, "Present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy (ransomed, justified—and therefore) acceptable unto God, which is your reasonable service" (Rom. 12:1); and when in obedience to that call, they fully consecrate their justified humanity to God a living sacrifice, side by side with that of Jesus, it is accepted of God; and in that very act the spiritual life is begun. Such find themselves at once thinking and acting as the new (transformed) mind prompts, even to the crucifixion of the human desires." . . .

"Thus to these embryo "new creatures" old things (human hopes, plans, etc.), pass away, all things become new."

"The birth of the 'new creature' is in the resurrection (Col. 1:18); . . . It should be remembered that we

are not actually spirit beings until the resurrection." . . .  
 "When we become spirit beings actually, that is when we are born of the Spirit, we will no longer be fleshly beings; for that which is born of the Spirit *is spirit*." Vol 1, pp. 196, 197.

He thus represents the change as begun and carried on by man on occasion of God's giving an impulse through his truth, up to death and as completed by God in the "resurrection."

On this remark:

(1) That the spirit being (said here to be born) is not the same with that human animal in which begetting is said to be begun of God. The one passed into non-existence absolute and eternal. Such is his teaching. There is no regeneration of one being. The begettall process goes on in one being. The birth of the new creature is that of a subject belonging to another category of being. The new being to be called into existence is not I and has none but an absolutely arbitrary connection with me who am, if Russellism be true, to go out into blank non-entity? Russell gives us here more intolerable tom-foolery.

(2) The process, so far as carried out this side of the grave, is one in which God's part is moral suasion, and man's part the real outworking of the saving process. But this contradicts Paul's teaching, Romans 8:29 ff., where we are taught that every part of the saving *process* is carried on efficiently by God.

8. Russell magnifies man's part in his own salvation. He says: "The conditions on which the Church may be exalted with her Lord to the divine nature (2 Pet. 1:4), are precisely the same as the conditions on which he received it; even by following in his footprints (I Peter 2:21), presenting herself a living sacrifice, as he did, and then carrying out that consecrated vow until the sacrifice terminates in death." Vol. 1, p. 196.

Through Vol. 1, pp. 231-241, Russell teaches that the individuals of the three several classes of the saved, each work out their own salvation not instrumentally, but efficiently. He says that there are four classes in the nominal Gospel Church; that one class consists of those who "are fulfilling their covenant and are dead with Christ to earthly will, aims, and ambitions," that this class is to receive elevation to the divine nature; that a second class consists of those who believe and are justified, but do not sacrifice themselves and all that they have to God; that through belief, after passing through adversity and trouble, they shall be elevated to spiritual natures, though they shall fail of elevation to the divine nature; that the third class consists of those who are justified but not sanctified, not fully consecrated to God, and not begotten, therefore, not spirit beings, that, if they improve their opportunities in the millennial age, they shall be rewarded with human Adamic perfection; and that there is still another class, consisting of those who do not even believe on Jesus, that these, if they do not improve their probation in the millennial, shall be annihilated.

Russell teaches, accordingly, that there are three ways to salvation: (1) The "narrow way to life"—a way full of "dangers and difficulties"—the way to salvation to the divine nature, Vol. 1, p. 207ff.; (2) the same way less strenuously pursued to salvation to spiritual nature not so high as the divine, and (3) the high way to holiness." He writes of this latter way: "The way back to actual human perfection is to be made very plain and easy; so plain that none may mistake the way; so plain that the way-faring man, and those unacquainted therewith, shall not go astray."

This magnification of man's part in salvation aligns Russell so far with Pelagians; and is at war with the monergism of salvation, in its initial stages taught in the Scriptures. The un-Biblical character of the doctrine that men are



saved to one or other of these different sorts of salvation, two of them involving the substitution of a different substance for the human is without warrant in the word of God—a piece of heathenism—a form of Gnosticism rivaling the forms current in second and third centuries.

9. Russell seems to teach that repentance and faith are produced simply by the operation of suitable divine truth. He says: "We now suggest that only the few have ever had a sufficiency of light to produce full faith, repentance and reformation." Vol. 1, p. 158.

But the Scriptures teach that faith is the activity of a regenerate heart, and is the gift of God, not through the truth, but on occasion of the presentation of truth.

10. Russell teaches concerning justification as follows: "The condition upon which (in this age) we come to the justified or perfect human plane is that Christ died for our sins, redeemed us and lifted us up, 'through faith in his blood' to the perfect plane from which, in Adam, we fell. And being justified *by faith*, we have peace 'with God' (Rom. 5:1), and are no longer esteemed by God as enemies, but as justified human sons, on the same plane as Adam and the Lord Jesus, except that they were actually perfect, while we are merely reckoned so by God." Vol. 1, p. 232. Cf. 236.

This teaching jumbles the Scriptural teaching concerning justification. Scripture represents justification as pardon plus 'grant of title to eternal blessedness. Russell says, justification restores, "reckonedly" to *Adamic* perfection. The Scriptures teach that justification is forgiveness of sins and an inheritance among the saints. See such texts as Gal. 4:5, "God sent forth his Son . . . that he might redeem them that were under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons."

Russell's doctrine makes faith the ground of justification also. In this he is Arminian.

Russell says, Vol. 5, p. 241: "Actual justification will be the route of approach toward God during the millennium, under the guidance and help of the great mediator." He teaches that in that age most men will, when standing probation, succeed, that the law will be lowered proportionately to man's weakened powers, and rise only with the rise of his powers—that justification will be a man's own work.

In addition to all its other follies, his doctrine here is strongly Pelagian.

11. Russell teaches of Sanctification and Good-works, in general, as a Semi-Pelagian, but his teachings has its own peculiarities. The members of the "little flock" may carry on their sanctification to the point of "sinless perfection." The merely justified may fail altogether to improve their opportunities in this life or even in the Millennium, and so fail to win Adamic perfection. On the other hand, they may in the millennial age reach "Adamic perfection." Everything rests with them.

Not to go into further details Russell's Soteriology is a soteriology without a redeemer competent to man's redemption, without a recreative agent competent to renew man's nature—a soteriology Pelagian and heathen.

*IV. Russell's Doctrine of the Sacraments, Baptism and the Lord's Supper.*

He holds that immersion is the proper mode of symbolical, or water, baptism; and that it should be applied to believers only. He represents water baptism as symbolical of the burial of the believer into Christ.

There is nothing in these contentions that is probably correct, though there is nothing which is new or peculiar to this heretic.

He holds that the Lord's Supper is a memorial of the anti-typical lamb—of Christ (repudiates the doctrine of the Roman Catholic Mass). His presentation of the sacraments is feeble.

*V. Russell's Eschatology, or his teaching concerning Death, the Resurrection, the Return of Christ, the Millennium, the General Judgment, Eternal Life, the Punishment of the Incurrible, etc.*

1. Russell teaches of death that it is "non-existence," or "extinction of being." Thus he says: "I should be further remembered that when Adam forfeited life, he forfeited it forever; and not one of his posterity has ever been able to expiate his guilt or to regain the lost inheritance. All the race are either dead or dying. And if they could not expiate their guilt before death, they certainly could not do it when dead—when not in existence." Vol. 1, p. 154.

"However, none can appreciate this Scriptural argument who do not admit the Scriptural statement that death—extinction of being—is the wages of sin. Those who think of death as life in torment not only disregard the meaning of the words *death and life*, which are opposites, but involve themselves in two absurdities." Vol. 1, p. 159.

But Abraham, Dives, Lazarus, Moses, Samuel, Christ, the penitent thief on the cross, and others, are all represented as being, or about to live, after "death" and prior to any resurrection or restitution. Paul wrote, "I am in a strait betwixt two, having a desire to depart and be with Christ" (Phil. 1:23); "to be absent with the body is to be present with the Lord," 2 Cor. 5:8. Paul plainly had no such view of death as C. T. Russell. The Lord Jesus Christ taught that "God is the God of the living."

Russell has an easy way of obviating the force of inconvenient texts. For example, in handling the account of the rich man and Lazarus, he makes Lazarus represent the Gentiles who have received the Gospel, while the rich man stands for Judah and Benjamin, and his five brothers for the remaining ten tribes. Hear some further of his lucubrations on the same story.

"Only very recently we have had an exhibition of how this rich man (Israel), dead as a nation, but alive as a people, has appealed to father Abraham to have Lazarus cool his tongue with a drop of water. Of course the thought would not be that a spirit finger should take a literal drop of water to cool a literal tongue. The interpretation must be looked for along the lines of a parable. The fulfillment came when the Jews of this country, in a general petition, requested the president of the United States to co-operate with other Christian nations and intercede on behalf of their members in Russia that they might have more liberty and less persecution, that their torments might be cooled." Vol. 1, No. 4, of People's Pulpit, column 1, p. 2.

2. Russell teaches concerning the Resurrection:

"Believers can for themselves (and by a knowledge of God's plan, for others also), commit their spirits (their power of life) to God's hand also, as did our Lord and as did Stephen—full of faith that God's promise of a *resurrection* would be fulfilled. A resurrection will mean to the world a reorganization of a human body, and its vivifying or quickening with life-energy, the spirit of life (Heb. *ruach* Greek, *pneuma*. To the Gospel Church, sharers in the "first (chief) resurrection," it will mean the impartation of the spirit of life energy (Heb. *ruach*, Greek *pneuma*) to a spirit body. I Cor. 13:42-45; Vol. 5, p. 316.

There are, therefore, according to Russell, two kinds of "resurrection," one of the sharers in the "first resurrection"—the "impartation of the spirit of life," or "life energy," to a "spirit body," the other a reorganization of a human body, and its vivifying, or quickening with life energy. There is no resurrection here of the bodies of saints according to Russell's own terms." Their resurrection he says consists in the impartation of life energy to a "spirit body." Their old body was dissolved into atoms and they passed into

non-existence, a new body, of an altogether different nature is, in "due time," brought into existence instead of the old, and life-energy introduced into it. This new being to take the place of C. F. Russell, has no more connection with him than has the angel Gabriel. Suppose he begins to think as C. F. Russell ceased to think and suppose he shall carry on the same lines of deception and suppose he turn out to be just as resourceful as the notorious C. T. Russell, and be dubbed C. T. Russell, will he be the C. T. Russell, of Pittsburg, Brooklyn? No; Russell tells us that that Russell of Pittsburg, etc., at death ceases to exist.

The "resurrection" of the man of the world will also, if Russell's teaching be true, not be a resurrection of the man of the world who died, but a creation of some one else in his place, who will have a chance at an individual probation in the millennium. The man of the world at death became non-existent. He never could rise.

Russell should call his "resurrection" by some other name. He hangs to the Bible word, but puts into it a meaning at war with the Bible meaning of the word.

The Bible view of the resurrection is illustrated in the account of our Lord's resurrection. He is represented as continuing to exist in his spiritual nature in and through death, as resurrected as to his body, that body being raised from a state of death.

3. Russell teaches as to the return of Christ, that "He (our Lord), is no longer human in any sense or degree; for we must not forget what we have learned (see Vol. 1., Chap. 10), that natures are separate and distinct. Since he is no longer in any sense or degree a human being, we must not expect him to come again as a human being, as at the first advent. His second coming is to be in a different manner as well as for a different purpose." Vol. 2, p. 107.

"Though our Lord at his second advent will not mani-

fest his presence in the same way that he did during those forty days after his resurrection, yet we have his assurance that the 'Brethren shall not be in darkness.' Nay, more, we shall have an aid, which they could not and did not have to help them during those forty days, viz., "power from on high," to guide us into the understanding of every truth due to be understood, and even as promised to show us things to come. Hence in due season we shall have full understanding of the manner, time and attendant circumstances of his appearing." Vol. 2, p. 122.

"It is the Lord's plan that his spiritual Kingdom shall communicate, operate and manifest its presence and power through human, earthly agencies." Vol. 2, p. 123.

"No one properly recognizing his great exaltation can expect at his second coming the man Christ Jesus in the body of flesh prepared for sacrifice and wounded and given in death as our ransom." Vol. 2, p. 135.

"We should expect that Christ would be manifest in the flesh of mankind in the same manner that, when the Word was *made flesh*, and dwelt among men, God was manifest in his flesh."

"Mankind in general, as its members come gradually back to the long-lost image of God, will be fleshly images and likenesses of the Father and of Christ. At the very beginning of the Millennium, as we have seen, there will be samples of perfect manhood before the world (Vol. 1, pp. 287-293); Abraham, Isaac and Jacob and the holy prophets, already tried and approved, will be the 'princes' among men, the exponents and representatives of the spiritual invisible Kingdom. In these Christ will be manifested—in their flesh. And as 'Whosoever will, reaches perfection and comes into full harmony with the will of Christ, every such one will be an image of God and of Christ, and in each of these Christ will be manifested.' Vol. 2, p. 136.

"The Christ 'changed' made partakers of the divine nature, shall be spirit beings as truly as is Satan and equally invisible to men. Their operations will be similar in manner, though directly opposite in character and results, their honored agents not bound and made slaves by ignorance and weakness, as are most of the servants of Satan, but made perfect, and 'free indeed,' will act intelligently and harmoniously, from choice and from love; and their appointments will be rewards of righteousness." Vol. 2, p. 137.

Thus Russell denies a bodily return of Christ. Christ is to come back—rather Russell teaches that he came back in 1874—and manifest himself through perfect human beings.

Tell Russell that the Scriptures represent the return of Christ as in bodily form—that men shall see him, he will carry you drearily through pages endeavoring to explain that men shall see Christ on his second advent only through their mind's eyes. Passages that are to be taken literally as the contexts show, he takes figuratively.

4. Russell teaches, concerning the millennium, that the Bible "shows that all who do not see or appreciate the blessed privilege of entering shall in due time be brought to a full knowledge and appreciation (of the 'door of hope'). The only way by which any and all of the condemned race may come to God, is not by meritorious works, neither by ignorance, but by faith in the precious blood of Christ, which taketh away the sin of the world." Vol. 1, p. 104. He teaches that all who ever have lived, are living or shall live between the beginning and the Millennium and had no knowledge or appreciation of Christ are to be "resurrected" from non-existence and given a good long trial in the millennial age, and that the most of them will avail themselves of that opportunity for restoration to the Adamic perfection. He builds very largely on I. Timothy 2:5, 6: "There

is one God, and one Mediator between God and man, the man Christ Jesus, who gave himself a ransom for all, to be testified in due time." He says, "God has a time for everything. He could have testified to these in their past life-time. But since he did not, it proves their due time must be future." Vol. 1, p. 105. Russell has a great way of reading into Scripture words not found. E. g., on p. 107 of Vol. 1, he has to be *testified to all in due time*.

Now this verse teaches that the oneness of the Mediator, who gave himself a ransom for all by his death, was the great truth which when the fulness of time was come and onward to the time of Christ's return, was to be testified of by Apostles, evangelists, ministers—the Church which was commissioned to make disciples of all nations.

No exegesis of this and the other passages adduced can get out of it and them any support for the doctrine of a publication of the Gospel to all the Millennium who have not believed in this life. For this text must be taken in the light of 2 Cor. 5:10; 2 Cor. 5:11; Luke 16:26; Isa. 38:11. For a discussion of Second Probation, see Asa E. House, *The Homilist*, pp. 183, ff., and the whole Bible.

Russell meanders on: "God thus limits the evil which he permits, by providing that the millennial reign of Christ shall accomplish the full extinction of evil and also of wilful evil-doers, and usher in an eternity of righteousness, based upon full knowledge and perfect free-will obedience by perfect beings." (Vol. 1, p. 133).

Our Lord Jesus Christ, on the other hand, says of some that they "shall go away into everlasting punishment." Matt. 25:46.

In teaching that the second advent of Christ took place in 1874, that those who were asleep in Christ—"the little flock"—experienced their resurrection in 1878, and that the time of the Church of Christ expired in October, 1914, that



the overthrow of Christendom immediately followed; that "the present governments must all be overturned about the close of A. D. 1915" (Vol. 2, p. 243), he teaches what history has not confirmed, but apparently refuted. If Christ came in any special way in 1874, that remains to be proved; if the resurrection of the "little flock" took place in 1878, we want proof; if the Christian Church no longer exists since 1914, there are millions of honester people than Russell either mistaken or intentionally lying. They represent the Church as active today. There is a good deal of commotion amongst the governments, but certainly the most of them were not aware of having been overturned at the close of 1915.

5. Russell resolves the day of judgment into a probationary trial (millennium). (See Vol. 1, pp. 137-143). He says: "The second trial will be more favorable than the first, because of the experience gained under the results of the first trial" (that in Adam). "Unlike the first trial, the second trial will be one in which every man will stand the test for himself alone, and not for another. None will then die because of Adam's sin, or because of inherited imperfections. . . . Under the reign of Christ mankind will gradually be educated, trained and disciplined until they reach perfection. And when they have reached perfection, perfect harmony with God will be required, and any who then fall short of perfect obedience will be cut off, being judged unworthy of life. The sin which brought death to the race through Adam was simply one disobedient act; but by that act he fell from his perfection. God had a right to demand perfect obedience of him, since he was created perfect; and he will demand the same of all men when the great work of restoring them is complete." Vol. 1, pp. 143-4.

Now, over against this Russellite doctrine which resolves the judgment into another period of probation, we set Paul,

2 Cor. 5:10: "We must all be made manifest before the judgment seat of Christ; that each one may receive the things done in the body, according to what he hath done, whether it be good or bad," and Matt. 25:31-46. These and other passages make it plain that there is to be a real forensic judgment, and that men are to be judged for what they have done in the body. These passages do not speak of a probationary period; but a day of declaration of awards.

6. Russell teaches concerning "eternal life," that it is mere existence, exclusively a quantity not a quality of life, that it is not something now won by faith, but a future inheritance conditioned upon good conduct and character during a period of probation.

But John 3:36, says: "He that believeth on the Son hath eternal life." "Nothing certainly is so evident as that, in the Bible, 'life' means a spiritual state (with its 'physical' counterpart, of course) marked by intensive quality, and deriving this quality from the relationship in which the living person is conceived as standing to the living God. 'Life' is used frequently as the equivalent of 'eternal life,' that is, it connotes blessedness, activity and vigor of which the believer is participant in virtue of his unity with God through Christ." Mackintosh, *Immortality and the Future*, p. 214.

7. Russell teaches of the punishment of the incorrigible, of the millennial period—of those who will not when given individual trial avail themselves of their opportunities for life—that they are annihilated. He says, after this future probation, "Then those who prove themselves unworthy of life will die again—the second death—from which there will be no redemption, and consequently no resurrection. . . . The death which comes as a result of individual, wilful apostasy is final. This sin hath never forgiveness, and its penalty, the second death, will be everlasting—not everlasting dying, but everlasting death—a death unbroken by a resurrection." Vol. 1, p. 158.

Death, remember, according to Russell, is non-existence. Not so according to the Bible. The Biblical meaning of life fixes that of death. "Death is the absence of all that forms the specific content of life. It is the withdrawal of everything that imparts value to life for the religious mind. Contact with God is lost, and with it all that is wrapped up in the word 'blessedness.' No terms of description are too vivid or powerful to paint its misery and ruin. It is destruction, perishing, the last calamity. . . . But the definite loss of consciousness is nowhere associated with it. As Prof. A. B. Davidson has said of the writers of the Old Testament: 'For all that appears, the idea that any person should become extinct or be annihilated never occurred to them.' In their view to survive apart from God is to abide in death. Because death is 'abiding,' and not non-existence. New Testament writers can speak of men as having passed 'from death unto life,' and can ascribe tribulation and anguish to the life of the lost in the world to come. In short, to render life and death as existence and non-existence is to represent the Bible as fixing its chief interest not in spiritual realities but in a bare and hard ontology. Death is to be undone, to be in ruin, to miss everything that can be called well-being; but it is not to vanish in extinction. Thus one of the main pleas of annihilationism, that to call death what is a kind of suffering life is absurd, will not bear scrutiny for a moment in the light of Bible teaching. Even common speech refutes it. We speak of a dead tree, or dead flesh, because these things have parted with all that constituted their value or charm; but they have not ceased to be. What has happened is a rupture of the tie linking them to life." Mackintosh, *Immortality and the Future*, pp. 214-215.

Christ says of some that they "shall go away into everlasting punishment," Matt. 23:46.

VI. *The Fruit of Russellism does not speak well for the moral worth of the ism.*

It is fair to test the character of a system by its fruits. This was a method of the Master.

Russell in his later years may be taken as a fair sample of the kind of man Russellism tends to make: and, unless he has been grossly slandered his character would indicate that the teaching is not good.

1. He could hardly have been a worthy husband. In 1879 he had married Miss Maria F. Ackley. She divorced him after many years of married life, on the ground of cruelty and of having wrong relations with other women. In court she proved improprieties between him and a woman named Rose Bell.

2. He has changed the name of his publications at least three times. He is charged with having done this, in part, to frustrate the verdict of the court in giving his wife alimony, and in part to prevent his publication business from suffering because of his shady reputation.

3. He has deceived a wide public by publishing his writings under the appellation of the "International Bible Students' Association." People have been led by this title to believe that a great body of accredited scholars representing many nations is back of these views. But the title is a misnomer. The views are those of C. T. Russell. The Brooklyn Eagle charged him with giving out that he was an interdenominationalist, whereas he was connected with none but opposed to all.

4. The same paper charged him with publishing himself as having given addresses to great crowds in important places, whereas he had not spoken in those places at all.

5. It charged him with seeking to dupe certain ministers into supporting daring transactions connected with lead, asphalt and turpentine companies.

6. It charged him with selling or causing to be sold "Miracle Wheat," at \$60.00 a bushel, with influencing the

sick and dying to make their wills in his favor, with engineering the sale of a property worth \$35,000 for \$50, for the purpose of defrauding another. (See Some Facts and More Facts about the Self-Styled "Pastor" Charles T. Russell.)

7. It is charged that he has contradicted himself repeatedly while under oath—that he has been guilty of perjury repeatedly. (Facts and More Facts, pp. 18, 19).

8. It is charged that he became very wealthy and yet that he posed as poor, holding his properties not in his own name.

9. It is charged that he has belittled the labors and services of the greatest servants of Christ throughout the ages; that notably he has endeavored to belittle modern missionaries and their labors. (See C. C. Cook's "All About One Russell," pp. 20 ff.) to belittle the labors of Carey, Judson, Morrison, Livingston, and the like.

He had met but two missionaries in all his travels—had not talked on missions with them—knew nothing of missions.

10. His advertisements of himself as Pastor Russell, "of the Brooklyn Tabernacle," and of the "London Tabernacle," were misleading.

11. He lacked forms of ministry to human need.

12. He is charged with blasphemy, or slander of God and his Word. On page 298, of his Watch Tower, of the issue of September 15, 1910, it is written, concerning his books:

"If the six volumes of 'Scripture Studies' are practically the Bible, topically arranged, with Bible proof texts given, we might not improperly name the volumes 'The Bible in an arranged form.' That is to say, they are not mere comments on the Bible, but they are practically the Bible itself. Furthermore, not only do we find that people cannot see the Divine plan in studying the Bible by itself, but we see also, that if any one lays the 'Scripture Studies' aside,

even after he has used them, after he has become familiar with them, after he had read them for ten years—if he then lays them aside and ignores them and goes to the Bible alone, though he has understood his Bible for ten years, our experience shows that within two years he goes into darkness. On the other hand, if he had merely read the ‘Scripture Studies’ with their references and had not read a page of the Bible as such, he would be in the light at the end of two years, because he would have the light of the Scriptures.” (Facts and More Facts about Pastor Russell, p. 42). Is he not an anti-Christ?

It should be noted that when Russell sued the Brooklyn Eagle for \$100,000, the court gave judgment against him, thus justifying the Eagle for exposing this impostor.

Russell’s no-hell doctrine may have been begotten in part by the wish that there be no hell for such sinners as himself.

*In fine:*

Russellism is one of the most blasphemous and destructive of all heresies. It contradicts almost every fundamental doctrine of the Christian faith. It boldly denies the proper deity, incarnation, resurrection, ascension and priestly intercession of Jesus Christ. It teaches that he perished—passed into non-existence—is eternally dead. It denies the personality and work of the Holy Ghost, and makes the Holy Ghost a mere influence. It degrades man to the level of an animal, robs him of spirit dowered with endless existence, turns the penalty for sin into annihilation. It gives us a creature savior impotent to bring us to God, vitiates the Scriptural doctrines of regeneration, faith, repentance, justification. It perverts the doctrine of Christ’s second coming, the judgment to come, life eternal, and everlasting death.\*

---

\*See Summary of Millennial Dawnism, in C. C. Cook’s, “All About One Russell,” pp. 18, 19.

# Nietzscheism: or the Will to Power

*Recent world movements give to Nietzsche's teaching an  
interest of no mean kind.*

## Literature on Nietzscheism

---

*The Complete Works of Friedrich Nietzsche.*

The first complete and authorized English translation.

Edited by Dr. Oscar Levy, in 18 volumes. Edinburgh and London. 1909-1913, is a convenient version.

Lichtenberger, Henri: *The Gospel of Superman.* 1910. London.

Figgis, J. N., D. D., Litt. D.: *The Will to Freedom.* (An able book).

Mugge, M. A.: *Friedrich Nietzsche.*



## Nietzscheism: or the Will to Power

---

### I. Who was Nietzsche?

Friedrich Nietzsche was born October 15, 1844, in the village of Röcken, in the Prussian province of Saxony. His father, a son and grandson of ministers, was Karl Ludwig Nietzsche, who became mentally deranged and died while Friedrich was still a small boy; his mother was Franziska Oehler, a daughter and granddaughter of ministers, a woman of apparent piety, who reared her son with care, saw his development into apostasy, his lapse into lunacy, and tended him with devoted solicitude in his years of insanity. Frau Nietzsche, on the death of her husband, removed with her two children, Friedrich and Elizabeth, to Naumburg, and brought them up in a pious and respectable circle.

Friedrich, as a boy, disliked vulgarity, made few friends, but formed some passionate attachments, did well as a student in the local school. From Naumburg he was sent to the ancient and famous public school at Pforta—a school in which boys were prepared for a university course—a school which endeavored to mold the life as well as to inform the mind. He was regarded as a brilliant student in everything but mathematics, got into one serious scrape, at least, for drunkenness, received the stamp of the school—a kindled desire to achieve a reputation for himself regardless of cost. Here he lost his inherited faith. He had been brought up in the externals of the Lutheran religion. The higher criticism expounded by one or two of his masters bore its legitimate fruit in the soil of his heart. He hauled up the anchors of his ship, left the moorings of the word of God and sailed forth on the sea of doubt without chart, or compass.

From Pforta he proceeded to Bonn, in 1864, became a typical university student, given to beer-drinking, singing, and duelling as much as to study, but, after a little, wearied of this life, turned more to the study of philology, and for recreation, to music. While studying here, he wrote to his sister, who was worrying over his religious, or irreligious attitude: "If you desire peace of soul and happiness, believe; if you want to be a disciple of truth, search." In the fall of 1865, he went to Leipsic, where he studied philology hard for two years, came under the influence of Schopenhauer, whose philosophy as set forth in "The World as Will and Idea," revolutionized his outlook on life, and cut every remaining fibre binding him to Christianity. True, he was for the most part professedly to repudiate this system, and to bedevil sympathy and resignation of which Schopenhauer makes so much; but he received indelible marks from the hand of Schopenhauer.

In 1867, he had, though short-sighted, to fulfill the obligation to one year's military service. He turned out to be a promising soldier, was an excellent horseman, and developed a fondness for war and an itch for class distinction; but an accident, the laceration of pectoral muscles while mounting his horse, put a stop to his military career.

Returning to Leipsic, he gave himself with great energy and brilliancy to philology; became acquainted with Wagner's music and enamored of Wagner himself; was recommended by his professor Ritschl for the Chair of Classical Philology in the University of Basle, and, though only twenty-four years of age, and, as yet, without a doctor's degree, was elected to the chair. There, in the course of 1869, he is found lecturing to eight students in philology. Wagner was now the idol of Nietzsche—an idol whom he called, in 1888, "a clever rattlesnake, a typical decadent."

During the Franco-Prussian war of 1870, although

Nietzsche had become, in order to serve as Professor in Basle, a citizen of Switzerland, he obtained leave to go to the front as a nurse. While employed in caring for wounded German soldiers, he contracted from them dysentery and diphtheria. Returning to his professorship before his health was sufficiently restored, he fell ill, suffered from insomnia, indigestion, eye trouble, neuralgia. After ten years of professorial life, his state of health compelled him to resign, in 1879.

Meantime he had begun to write books. Late in 1879, his "*The Birth of Tragedy*" had appeared—a Wagnerite tract. In it he contrasts Greek culture before and after Socrates. The culture, the civilization before Socrates was strong, cruel, grand; the culture after Socrates was "impious, bloodless, feeble." "Socrates was a degenerate." The culture of the writer's own age is pronounced to be decadent, Socratic, not Dionysian. The author seems to teach that the tragic, cruel, grand age will return if the voice of Wagner's great, mystic, music be heeded. The philosophic standpoint of the book is seen in these statements: "Only as aesthetic phenomena existence and the world appear justified." "Art supplies man with the necessary veil of illusion which is required for action. For the true knowledge of the awfulness and absurdity of existence kills action." He betrays, even in this work, himself as wanting in a sense of right.

Between 1873 and 1876, he published four long essays which were entitled *Thoughts Out of Season*. In the first he trounces the shallowness and self-sufficiency of his contemporary German teaching; in the second he excoriates his contemporaries and those professors who make historic learning an idol, and by it destroy illusions and rob existing things thus of the only conditions in which they can live; in the third, he extols Schopenhauer as the great philosopher

and type of the future man, and skins the state-paid servile university professor; in the fourth, he lauds Wagner as the discoverer of art. He says of Wagner: "No artist of what past soever has yet received such a remarkable portion of genius." As yet Nietzsche regarded Wagner as a great anti-Christian force. As Wagner began to adopt at least sentimental reverence for Christianity, Nietzsche began to cool in admiration for the great musician, and to regard him as a corrupter and seducer. Some years later, in his *Ecce Homo* he represents himself as portraying Nietzsche the Philosopher, and Nietzsche the Musician, under the names of "Schopenhauer" and "Wagner."

In *Human, All-too-Human*, a new Nietzsche appeared, one who would purge himself of all inherited ideals, of all faith and morals—a writer of aphorisms, thirteen hundred of them—some of them profound, some full of folly and madness and hate.

In *The Dawn of Day*, in 1881, we have the rudiments of what may be called his own philosophy, hidden in a vast mass of aphorisms dealing with as many subjects. That philosophy is marked by its hatred for Christianity. He is a Julian the Apostate of the 19th century: "Christianity" has developed into soft moralism." Another marked characteristic is materialism. The materials for a correct philosophy are to be found only in "physiology and medicine." Another characteristic is zeal for eugenics; and still another is the doctrine of an eternal recurrency, which he thought to be original with him. He says that "with this book he opened his campaign against morality." *Ecce Homo*, p. 91).

In *The Joyful Wisdom*, the superman is brought to the fore, the man who shall down all obstacles, all forces, all weaker men, and grow stronger and stronger. He "dances freely on the corpse of morality." (See *Ecce Homo*, p. 96).

*Thus Spake Zarathustra* was written and published in

1883 and 1884. Having thrown behind him for the time the hopeless mechanism of the eternal recurrence, he affirms, in the earlier portion of this work, clearly the ideal of the superman as a goal toward which all master-men should strive. "*I teach to you the Superman.* Man is something that is to be surpassed. What have ye done to surpass man? All beings hitherto have created something beyond themselves, and ye want to be the ebb of that great tide, and would rather go back to the beast than surpass man? The superman is the meaning of the earth. Let your will say: The superman shall be the meaning of the earth! I conjure you, my brethren, remain true to the earth, and believe not those who speak unto you of super-earthly hopes." Later, in the same work, his chariot wheels are clogged by the return of the doctrine of the Eternal Recurrence. He jumbles his doctrine of immoral *Will to power* with a doctrine of an eternal physical round—the physical being the all.

This work he, with unmeasured egotism, pronounced the deepest book and the greatest gift ever granted to men.

In 1886, *Beyond Good and Evil*, a "*Prelude to a Philosophy of the Future*"—his teaching as a whole which he planned to set forth as a system—was published. Interesting features of this work are his attitude of super-nationalism, his anti-English attitude. He says of the English: "They are a fundamentally mediocre species. . . . ponderous, conscience-stricken, herding animals." Of Shakespeare he speaks as that marvelous, Spanish-Moorish-Saxon synthesis of taste, over whom an ancient Athenian of the circle of Aeschylus would have half-killed himself with laughter or irritation," of Carlyle, as "the absurd muddle-head." In his own view "this book is a criticism of *modernity*, embracing the modern sciences, arts, even politics, together with certain indications as to a type which should

be the reverse of modern man, or as little like him as possible." (*Ecce Homo*, p. 113).

Since his death the notes intended to furnish materials for his "The Will to Power," have been published. In this work he had set out to show, that *the will to Power*, and not the *struggle for existence* is the *life principle*; that socialism is the tyranny of the meanest and most brainless; that Christianity is the greatest curse that has fallen upon the world; that English philosophy is worthless trash. He was thus to prepare the way for the Super-man.

In his "The Genealogy of Morals," published in 1887, Nietzsche raises the question: "*Under what conditions did Man invent for himself those judgments of values, Good and Evil? And what value do they possess?*" This work contains his guesses as to "evolution" of guilt, bad conscience, punishment, mingled with insane estimates of his own powers and place. (Cf. *Ecce Homo*, p. 117).

In 1888 we have his *The Case of Wagner*, in which Wagner is described as "an actor not a musician; a symptom of impoverished life, a clever rattle-snake, a typical decadent." On the heels of this we have his *The Twilight of Idols*—a hilarious, super-egotistical book, in which he knocks Carlyle, and all free-thinking moral fanatics. Next came his *The Antichrist*, in which he represents Christianity as "the one great curse, the one enormous and innermost perversion, the one great instinct of revenge, full of lies and more dangerous to life than any other religion. Next came from his pen *Ecce Homo*, in which he represents himself as the greatest of men to date. The chapter headings are: "Why am I so wise? Why am I so clever? Why write I such excellent books?" He says: "I did a host of things of the highest rank—things that no man can do nowadays." . . . "To take up my books is one of the rarest honors that a man can pay himself. . . . Before my time there was no psychology."

He went mad in January, 1889, he proclaimed himself God.

Before long his aged mother began caring for him again. After her death his sister took him in charge. He continued to exist till August 25th, 1900.

## II. *What did he dream of doing?*

Chiefly, he dreamed of leading master-men to the development of the superman. Hear him. He says:

"My life-task is to prepare for humanity one supreme moment in which it can come to its senses, a Great Noon in which it will turn its gaze backwards and forwards, in which it will step from under the yoke of accident and of priests, and for the first time settle the question of the "Why and Wherefore of humanity as a whole—this life task naturally follows out of the conviction that mankind does not get on the right road of its own accord. (*Ecce Homo*, 93, I).

"*I teach you the Superman.* Man is something that is to be surpassed. What is the ape to man? A laughing-stock, a thing of shame. And just the same shall man be to the Superman: a laughing-stock, a thing of shame." (Thus spake Zarathustra, p. 6).

"The Superman is the meaning of the earth. Let your will say: The Superman *shall* be the meaning of the earth! I conjure you, my brethren, *remain true to the earth*, and believe not those who speak unto you of super-earthly hopes! Poisoners are they whether they know it or not." (*Ibid*, p. 7).

"I love him who liveth in order to know, and seeketh to know in order that the Superman may hereafter live. I love him who laboreth and inventeth that he may build the house for the Superman and prepare for him earth, animal and plant." (*Ibid.*, p. 10). "Lo, I am a herald of the lightning, and a heavy drop out of the cloud: the lightning, however, is the Superman." (*Ibid*, p. 11).

He would lift the naturally strong to greater strength and to the production of still stronger men—men of more efficient bodies and more efficient minds—men beyond good and evil—amoral men, using without scruple any means to accomplish their ends—greater Borgias, greater Napoleons.

He talks at times of redeeming men; but that of which he thinks is developing some strong men into power and the evolution of Superman.

To clear the way for a development of an amoral race of Supermen, he teaches that God is dead and that the universe is simple energy, "a sea of forces storming and raging in itself," "forever rolling back over incalculable ages to recurrence with an ebb and flow of its forms" . . . "world of eternal self-creation, of eternal self-destruction" . . . without aim unless there is an aim in the bliss of the circle; without will, unless a ring must by nature keep good will to itself;" that "This world is . . . the Will to Power—and nothing else" (Will to Power, II., 431);—a clock running down and, of its self- self-winding to the same recurrence; and that the ethical prison house built on faith in God has been demolished (Joyful Wisdom, 167); that master men may therefore do anything necessary, and that they should do everything and suffer every hardship in order, to the fuller, more powerful life of the Supermen; that they should court danger and adventure, overcome pity, and that they should above all be valorous.

He says of his disciples: To such . . . "I wish suffering, desolation, sickness, ill-treatment, indignities of all kinds. I wish them to be acquainted with profound self-contempt, with the martyrdom of self-distrust, with the misery of the defeated; I have no pity for them: because I wish them to have the only thing which today proves whether a man has any value or not, namely, the capacity of sticking to his guns." (Will to Power, II., 333). (Here



Nietzsche borrows the Christian doctrine of suffering as a means of developing holy character; perverts it and prostitutes it . . . to a place in his doctrine of the development of the Superman).

To stick to one's guns through thick and thin is to be a mighty incarnation of *Will to Power*, which is the one reality. This is to be a mighty man, it is to help bring into being the Superman.

But this exhortation to develop the Superman is a thing to which Nietzsche is logically incompetent. In his system individuals have no reality. At best they are soap-bubbles blown by the *Will to Power*, they are what they are because of the eternal energy; the Superman himself is but a large and highly colored soap bubble. As the wheels of the universe turn, he will come of necessity if he come at all. He has come if he is to come.

His attacks on "decadent ethics," "ethics as set forth by Schopenhauer, Kant, or Christ, because forsooth they are a "no-saying to life," a crushing of Will to Power," "a curbing of the strong in favor of the weak"—all these attacks are practical denials, of his doctrine that there is only one reality—the blind will to power; and that therefore men are but bubbles upon the current of life or the *Will to Power*. He forgot in them the half of his teaching.

Overlook for the time this conflict between his views of what men ought to do, and their being no men to do those things, forget not that he claims as his mission, the holding forth the Superman as the ideal which strong men should strive to produce. He held, also, that in order to the in-bringing of Supermen the strong need protection against the jealousy of the weak who are powerful in numbers. "The end can be reached only by securing a ruling race, or class, and by such subordination and breeding as will keep the individualities strong." This ruling class, in train-

ing itself, must be Spartan, and must shrink at nothing, set aside old rules of morals, regard morality as existing only for the mediocre—the herd, the world. The world is running to the mediocre—but there is at present a master caste of free adventurous spirits, defining itself ever more plainly. They prepare the way for the Superman.

They (the Supermen) are to have no more sympathy for common men than we have for the pigs we eat. They will live aloof from the common men—in lonely grandeur. They “will retranslate the word good into its older and more pagan equivalents, notable, proud, courageous, barbarous.” They will be free of morals—amoral—save that they must be courageous, self-controlled. They will be adventurous, fine in manners, able to command.

Recruited upon blood and training, resting upon a slave system, kept pure by eugenic methods, they will develop forms of culture higher than anything hitherto known—and carry forward the work of the Romans as they might have carried it had it not been for the curse of Christianity. They will not be the servants but the masters of society.

The production of these lords is worth all it will cost in blood and suffering and servitude of the weak, he teaches. The Superman will take what he wants and let others have as and only as he pleases. His development Nietzsche longs for. He is said to have declared that the Kaiser Wilhelm II. would understand the *Will to Power*.

Again, we remark the utter illogical character, the incompatibles, of his teaching: The Superman *ought* to be produced. Master Spirits *must* work for his production. But there is nothing new; things are eternally recurring. The Supermen that have not been, have been. So Nietzsche.

His teaching is as full of incompatibles as Mrs. Eddy's. There is no good, no bad for master men; courage is of moral worth, all other qualities are without moral value.

"Live dangerously," live differently from others. Be a big, tiger among all the tigers of earth. So live as to develop a race of super-tigers, is Nietzsche put baldly. Everything that is to be, it has been; and what has been will be.

### III. *Nietzsche's Attitude Toward Christianity.*

So far as it is a doctrine of a life beyond this, Nietzsche regarded Christianity as a pack of lies. As a way of life, a system of ethics, he regarded it as the worst curse which man has incurred. He regarded it as one of his own most original services to estimate Christian ethics as he did.

He says in *Ecce Homo*:

"No one hitherto has felt Christian morality beneath him; to that end there were needed height; remoteness of vision, and an abysmal psychological depth not believed to be possible hitherto. Up to the present, Christian morality has been the Circe of all thinkers—they stood at her service. What man before my time has descended into the underground caverns from out of which the poisonous fumes of this ideal—of this slandering of the world, burst forth?" (*Ecce Homo*, 138).

"What separates us, is not that we do not rediscover any God, either in history or in nature or behind nature—but that we recognize what was worshipped as God not as "divine," but as pitiable, as absurd, as injurious—not only as an error, but as a *crime against life*. We deny God as God. If this God of the Christians were proved to us, we should still less know how to believe in him. In a formula: *Deus qualem Paulus creavit, Dei negatio.*" (*Antichrist*, 316).

"That which defines me, that which makes me stand apart from the whole rest of humanity is the fact that I *unmasked* Christian morality . . . Christian morality is the most malignant form of all falsehood, the actual Circe of humanity, that which has corrupted mankind." (*Ecce Homo*, 139).

It is worth remarking that the God Nietzsche fights against and whose ethics he despises is not the God of the Bible, but the caricature of Him set up by modern German theologians, and his ethics a caricature of Bible ethics made by multitudes of modern Christians, and these caricatures of God and ethics vitiated and caricatured still further by Nietzsche himself, at the dictate of his theory of Will to Power. Naturally no man was more given to caricature, since for him truth was "*only useful illusion.*" Hear him further:

"Whenever the will to power declines in any way, there is always a physiological retrogression, a decadence. The deity of *decadence* pruned of his manliest virtues and impulses, henceforth, becomes necessarily the God of the physiologically retrograde, the weak. They do not call themselves the weak, they call themselves the good. . . . How can one defer so much to the simplicity of Christian theologians as to decree with them that the continuous development of God from the "God of Israel, from the national God to the Christian God, to the essence of everything good, is a progress? But so does even Renan. . . . It is just the very opposite that strikes the eye. When the presuppositions of ascending life, when everything strong, brave, domineering and proud has been eliminated out of the concept of God, when he sinks step by step to the symbol of a staff for the fatigued, a sheet anchor for all drowning ones, when he becomes the poor people's God, the sinner's God, the God of the sick *par excellence* and when predicate of the Savior is left as the sole divine predicate, what does such a change speak of? Such a reduction of the divine? To be sure the kingdom of God has thereby become greater. Formerly he had only his 'chosen people.' Since then he has gone abroad in his travels, quite like his people itself, since then he has never again settled down quietly in any

place, until he has finally become at home everywhere, the great 'Cosmopolitan'—till he has gained over 'the great number,' and the half of the earth to his side. But the God of the 'great number,' the democrat among the Gods, became nevertheless, no proud pagan God, he remained a Jew, he remained the God of the woods, the God of all dark corners, and of all unhealthy quarters throughout the world. . . . His world empire is still, as formerly an underworld empire, a hospital, a subterranean empire, a Ghetto empire. . . . And he himself, so pale, so weak, so decadent. Even the palest of the pale still become master over him—the Metaphysicians, the conceptual Albinos. They spun around about him so long, until hypnotized by their movements he became a cob-web-spinner, a meta-physician himself. Henceforth, he spun the world anew out of himself—*sub specie Spinozæ*—henceforth he transfigured himself always into the thinner and paler, he became 'ideal,' he became 'pure spirit,' he became 'absolutism,' he became 'thing in itself,' ruin of a God. . . . God became thing in itself.

"The Christian concept of God—God as God of the sick, God as cob-web spinner, God as spirit—is one of the most corrupt concepts of God ever arrived at on earth; it represents perhaps the low-water in the descending development of the God-type—God degenerated to the contradiction of life, instead of being its transfiguration and its eternal *yea!* . . . . God as the formula for every calumny of 'this world,' for every lie of 'another world.' In God nothingness deified, the will to nothingness declared holy!"

"This hybrid image of ruin derived from nullity, concept, and contradiction, in which all *decadent* instincts, all cowardices, and lassitudes of soul have their sanction." (Antichrist, 260-2).

Thus he mixes the Bible conception of God with every

nominally Christian speculator's conception of God—caricatures the God of the Scriptures. Thus deals he with the morals of the Scriptures. He treats with contempt his caricatures, deservedly. No doubt he hated also the Scriptural elements in his caricature with intense hatred. Had he, instead of caricaturing the true God of the Scriptures, and criticizing that, confined his polemics to the misconceptions of God by philosophic speculators, and the theological and popular misconceptions of God by which He is turned into a goody-goody old grandmother, or into some other such idol, Nietzsche's work would have had its value; but he hates every glimpse he gets of God as revealed in Christ and bedevils Him, while he is laughing to scorn these fancies as to what God is like. He hates Christian morals as boulders in the way of the ruthless struggle of the strong man to develop the Superman.

He holds that Christianity is the weapon with which the slave races have conquered their captors—the strong men. Hence he hates it—every shade of it which he has caught sight of. Holding that morality is the denial of the Will to Power, he vomits venom on what he takes for Christianity—Christian ethics.

For the Christian conceptions of right and wrong he would substitute radically different conceptions. Power, satisfied, triumphant, embodied in a conquering race, "the splendid blond beast," calls all its own characteristics good. Good meant in the first instance the quality of a ruling class. It is the same as noble and implies courage and enduring will, pride and self-sufficiency. Its opposite is the character of the enslaved people, base, mean, villainous. Thus goodness has nothing to do with love, humility, justice, or self-denial. These qualities are displayed by the down-trodden or at least admired by them. *Do unto others as you would have them do unto you* is the maxim of the herd, the helot, the outcast, the Chandala.

According to Nietzsche: "Morality is the idiosyncrasy of the decadent revenging themselves upon life." This peculiarity reached its highest incarnation in Jesus of Nazareth, who asserted the superiority before God of the 'poor, the maimed, the halt, the blind,' and denied the claims of the rulers; and by his crucifixion and the doctrine of his resurrection and reign as risen Savior, secured for two millenniums the triumph of slave morality." Nietzsche holds that the world was in a state at the time of Christ that favored the triumph of this morality, that multitudes of slaves filled the Empire, that they eagerly fell in with it as a system which would restore their dignity, that the mixture of races throughout the Empire brought with it a physiological depression, which mistaken for a sense of sin, made men eager for a salvation cult; that Socrates and Plato, the great "Greek decadents," had long corrupted the pagan mind with notions of goodness, justice, and the eternal world, that a dozen other tendencies wrought together to secure the triumph of this system over the Pagan Empire, "the proudest and most valuable organization of the Will to Power, which the world had known to that time; that this victory of morality is the victory of decadence; that "ascending life is ever pitiless and proud;" that Christian morality is useful for the herd, making life tolerable for them; and to be tolerated among the herd by strong men that the herd may be more content to serve as slaves of the strong; but that the strong should develop into the amoral class.

Nietzsche, as is clear from the above statements, either misunderstood, or deliberately misrepresented the Christianity of the New Testament. He perhaps never had any real comprehension of it, having been brought up only in the soulless externalities of the type of Christianity prevailing in Germany in his early years. It is certain that he apostatized from the type with which he was acquainted with all

the energy of a Julian the Apostate. We are not grieved at his attacks on much of what he supposes to be Christianity. Let him vent his venom on the ethics of Strauss, or Schopenhauer, or the ethics of the downy beds of ease Christians, we shall not raise a hand in defense; but his confusing of the true Christian ethics with these isms, and his attacks on genuine elements of the Christian ethics should be countered.

Remark:

1st. He is false in representing Christian ethics as working toward decadence in those under its influence. The New Testament says: "Quit you like men: be strong." It says: "Endure hardness as good soldiers." Given to the decaying, rotting, Greeco-Roman world, it gave hope and courage to that world, helped to develop masterful spirits in that world. True it developed, regard for the rights of others, justice, love, and humility before the infinitely perfect, sweetness of disposition; but these qualities are compatible with strength. Nietzsche should have acquainted himself with Puritanism of the sixteenth and the seventeenth centuries in Great Britain and the Netherlands. Had his prejudices against the English allowed him to see at all, he would have seen a type of Christianity, nearer to the ideal set up in the Scriptures and that it was making strong men. He would have seen that it was giving a dignity to these men, turning them into "a holy nation, and a royal priesthood, a peculiar people." A fair study of the Christian ethics would have shown him that in the two-fold end it assigns to man, one element is his own well-being. This fair study would have shown him that Christianity is a "yea-saying," to use his own jargon, to life, to every thing approvable in man, and a "nay saying" only to what ought to die. That he is false in teaching that Christianity cultivates only anaemic virtues is shown by such products as Cromwell, Gustavus



Adolphus, R. E. Lee, Stonewall Jackson, Chinese Gordon, and the great leaders and the great led of the Aglo-Saxons and their allies of today.

2d. Nietzsche is false in representing Christian ethics as purely altruistic. Nominally Christian ethical philosophers, here and there, may present systems of pure altruism; such is not the Christian system. That system teaches to love one's neighbors as ourselves. There is a legitimate love of self and it is given a distinct place. Moreover, in Christian ethics, a distinction is made between the love of benevolence and the love of moral approbation, and men are taught to stand with iron strength against being swayed by mere benevolence to go against the right. Christianity frowns on the doting indulgence of the grandmamma, and holds to the fore that love which is heroically controlled by regard to inexorable and eternal right.

3d. Nietzsche is false in representing Christianity as opposed to culture. Historical Christianity has not been opposed to culture. The Christian culture has been the noblest in the world. New Testament Christianity is not opposed to the culture of the best and highest in man. It does oppose all pandering to unworthy lusts.

4th. Nietzsche is false in representing Christianity as teaching that all men are equal before God—that there is no such thing as aristocracy of character. So far is this from the truth, that Christianity teaches that there are different degrees of excellence of character, both on earth and in heaven. The New Testament never asserts an identity of gifts for all men. It affirms the contrary. Not all are Pauls, or Peters. The New Testament does indeed assert the worth of every individual and vindicates to him certain rights; but it subordinates some to others, e. g., in the home, and in the state, and in the Church. It represents Christians as having gifts differing according to the grace given unto them.

5th. Nietzsche would substitute for Christianity—a way of life that would result in the development of Napoleons and Borgias. In denying that it is adapted to the development of such monsters as he would develop, he pays the highest tribute possible for him to Christianity. In speaking of Jesus of Nazareth as a “decadent,” a “madman,” “the most ill-natured of all men, suffering from a lunatic pride which delighted in humility,” he writes himself down as a decadent, as insane, as full of the poison of asps, as a bladder blown with gas of Hell’s own make. (See *Anti-christ*, pp. 314, 316).

6th. Nietzsche denies what Christianity affirms, the rights of man as man. He teaches that the Master man may use as he would a hoe or spade or steam-engine, any other man weaker than himself—without regard to any so-called rights in that other. Your conscience and mine condemn this utterly. Nietzsche has no Gospel for the poor, for the vast majority of men. He has for them only a message of contempt.

IV. *Where did Nietzsche get the stuff which he belched forth against Christianity and in advocacy of the onbringing of the Superman?*

He claimed that he got it by “Inspiration.” Hear him:

“Has any one at the end of the nineteenth century any distinct notion of what poets of a stronger age understood by the word inspiration? If not, I will describe it. If one had the smallest vestige of superstition left in one, it would hardly be possible completely to set aside the idea that one is the mere incarnation, mouthpiece, or medium of an almighty power. The idea of revelation, in the sense that something which profoundly convulses and upsets one becomes suddenly visible and audible with indescribable certainty and accuracy, describes the simple fact. One hears—one does not seek—one takes—one does not ask who gives;

a thought suddenly flashes up like lightning, it comes with necessity, without faltering—I have never had any choice in the matter. There is an ecstasy so great that the immense strain of it is sometimes relaxed by a flood of tears, during which one's steps now involuntarily rush and now involuntarily lag. There is the feeling that one is utterly out of hand with the very distinct consciousness of an endless number of fine thrills and titillations descending to one's very toes; there is a depth of happiness in which the most painful and gloomy parts do not act as antitheses to the rest, but are produced and required as necessary shades of color in such an overflow of light. There is an instinct for rhythmic relations which embraces a whole world of forms (length, the need of a wide embracing rhythm, is almost the measure of the force of an inspiration, a sort of counterpart to its pressure and tension). Everything happens quite involuntarily as if in a tempestuous outburst of freedom, of absoluteness, of power and divinity. The involuntary nature of the figures and similes is the most remarkable thing; one loses all perception of what is imagery and metaphor, everything seems to present itself as the readiest, truest and simplest means of expression. It actually seems to use one of Zarathustra's own phrases, as if all things come to one and offered themselves as similes. ("Here do all things come caressingly to thy discourse and flatter thee, for they would fain ride upon thy back. On every simile thou ridest here unto every truth. Here fly open unto thee all the speech and word shrines of the world, here would all existence become speech, here would all becoming learn of thee how to speak.") This is my experience of inspiration. I do not doubt but that I should have to go back thousands of years before I could find another who could say to me: 'It is mine also!' (Ecce Homo, 101-103).

"This work (Thus Spake Zarathustra) stands alone. Do

not let us mention the poets in the same breath. Nothing perhaps has ever been produced out of such a super-abundance of strength. My concept 'Dionysian' here becomes the *highest* deed; compared with it, everything that other men have done seems poor and limited. The fact that a Goethe or a Shakespeare would not for an instant have known how to take breath in this atmosphere of poison and the heights; the fact that by the side of Zarathustra, Dante is no more than a believer, and not one who first *creates* the truth—that is to say not a world-ruling spirit, a *Fate*; the fact that the poets of the Veda were priests and not even fit to unfasten Zarathustra's sandal—all this is the least of things and gives no idea of the distance, of the azure solitude in which this work dwells. . . . If all the spirit and goodness of every great soul were collected together, the whole could not create a single one of Zarathustra's discourses. . . . Until his coming no one knew what was height or depth and still less what was truth. There is not a single passage in this revelation of truth which had already been anticipated and divined by even the greatest of men. Before Zarathustra there was no wisdom, no probing of the soul, no art of speech; in his book the most familiar and the most vulgar thing utters unheard of words. The sentence quivers with passion. Eloquence has become music. Forks of lightning are hurled towards futures of which no one has ever dreamed before. The most powerful use of parables that has ever existed is poor beside it, and mere child's play compared with this return of language to the nature of imagery. (*Ecce Homo*, 106-108.)

Hear a sample of this revelation:

"With the new morning, however, there came unto me a new truth: then did I learn to say: 'Of what account to me are market-place and populace and populace-noise and long populace-ears!'

"Ye higher men, learn *this* from me: On the market-place no one believeth in higher men. But if ye will speak there, very well! The populace, however, blinketh: 'We are all equal.'

"'Ye higher men'—so blinketh the populace—'there are no higher men, we are all equal; man is man, before God—we are all equal!'

"Before God!—Now, however, this God hath died. Before the populace, however, we will not be equal. Ye higher men, away from the market-place. . . .

"Before God!—Now however this God hath died! Ye higher men, this God was your greatest danger.

"Only since he lay in the grave have ye again arisen. Now only cometh the great noontide, now only doth the higher man become—master!

"Have ye understood this word, O my brethren? Ye are frightened: do your hearts turn giddy? Doth the abyss here yawn for you? Doth the hell-hound here yelp at you?

"Well! Take heart! ye higher men! Now only travail-eth the mountain of the human future. God hath died; now do *we* desire—the Superman to live. . . .

"The most careful ask today: 'How is man to be maintained?' Zarathustra however asketh, as the first and only one: 'How is man to be *surpassed*?'

"The Superman, I have at heart; *that* is the first and only thing to me—and *not* man; not the neighbour, not the poorest, not the sorriest, not the best—

"O my brethren, what I can love in man is that he is an over-going and a down-going. And also in you there is much that maketh me love and hope.

"In that ye have despised, ye higher men, that maketh me hope. For the great despisers are the great reverers.

"In that ye have despaired, there is much to honour. For ye have not learned to submit yourselves, ye have not learned petty policy.

"For today have the petty people become master: they all preach submission and humility and policy and diligence and consideration and the long *et cetera* of petty virtues.

"Whatever is of the effeminate type, whatever originateth from the servile type, and especially the populace-mismash—that wisheth now to be master of all human destiny—O disgust! Disgust! Disgust!

"*That* asketh and asketh and never tireth: 'How is man to maintain himself best, longest, most pleasantly?' Thereby—are they the masters of today.

"These masters of today—surpass them, O my brethren—these petty people: *they* are the Superman's greatest danger!

"Surpass, ye higher men, the petty virtues, the petty policy, the sand-grain considerateness, the ant-hill trumpery, the pitiable comfortableness, the 'happiness of the greatest number!'

"And rather despair than submit yourselves. And verily, I love you, because ye know not today how to live, ye higher men! For thus do *ye live*—best! . . .

"Have ye courage, O my brethren? Are ye stout-hearted? *Not* the courage before witnesses, but anchorite and eagle courage, which not even a God any longer beholdeth?

"Cold souls, mules, the blind and the drunken, I do not call stout-hearted. He hath heart who knoweth fear, but *vanquisheth* it; who seeth the abyss, but with *pride*.

"He who seeth the abyss, but with eagle's eyes—he who with eagle's talons graspeth the abyss: he hath courage.

"'Man is evil'—so said to me for consolation, all the wisest ones. Ah, if only it be still true today! For the evil is man's best force.

"'Man must become better and eviler'—so do I teach. The evillest is necessary for the Superman's best.

"It may have been well for the preacher of the petty people to suffer and be burdened by men's sin. I, however, rejoice in great sin as my great *consolation*.

"Such things, however, are not said for long ears. Every word, also, is not suited for every mouth. These are fine, far-away things: at them sheep's claws shall not grasp!" Thus spake Zarathustra, pp. 350-353.

The contents of his writings, notwithstanding his extravagant claims, include nothing original. "His works are a veritable whispering gallery of literary echoes" (Figgis, 169). He borrowed from Machiavelli and Gobineau, from many strains of German literature (Thiele), from those Scriptures which he abhorred, from La Rochefoucauld, from Luther, Zoroaster. As for his originality in philosophy, M. Fouillee writes (*International Journal of Ethics*, 1903, p. 13): "Nietzsche has not the supreme originality which he claims for himself. Mix Greek sophistry and Greek scepticism with the materialism of Hobbes and the monism of Schopenhauer, corrected with the paradoxes of Rousseau and of Diderot' and the result will be the philosophy of Zarathustra." He writes again: "He fancies himself secure from the prejudices which emanate from the "herd," or are due to environment, and yet no one more than this singer of the praises of force and of war has gathered together into a single heap all the gregarious prejudices from Germany still feudal in the midst of the nineteenth century, all those dominant ideas which spring from the race, the environment and the moment, and combined with them corresponding ideas from antiquity, the Middle Ages and the Renaissance" (*Ibid*, 17).

He was a man of violent admirations; and is found appropriating, unconsciously from each of the personages to whom for the time he was a devotee. One day he is Wagnerite, the next, under the influence of Paul Rée, the day following the disciple of Darwin, and on the subsequent day bubbling with enthusiasm over Schopenhauer, and on a still later day decrying Kant and borrowing from him in one

breath.

No man had more contempt for the logical understanding than Nietzsche. According to him the whole method of logical reasoning is without any reference to reality. Logic is the cutting of the world into bits. It is not a guide to reality. We are driven to it by fatigue, not by love of knowledge, by the Will to Power.

"In order to be able to think and to draw conclusions, it is necessary to acknowledge that which exists: Logic only deals with formulae for things which are constant. That is why this acknowledgment would not in the least prove reality: That which is is part of our optics." (*The Will to Power*, II., 33).

"'Truth' is the will to be master over the manifold sensations that reach consciousness; it is the will to *classify* phenomena according to definite categories."

"The criterion of truth lies in the enhancement of the feeling of power.

"According to my way of thinking, 'truth' does not necessarily mean the opposite of error, but in the most fundamental cases, merely the relation of different errors to each other; thus one error might be older, deeper than another, perhaps altogether ineradicable, one without which organic creatures like ourselves could not exist; whereas other errors might not tyrannize over us to that extent as conditions of existence, but when measured according to the standard of those other tyrants could even be laid aside." (*The Will to Power*, II., 49).

"'Man projects his instinct of truth' (that form of illusion which enables one to live), his 'aim,' to a certain extent beyond himself, in the form of a metaphysical world of Being, a 'thing in itself,' a world already to hand. His requirements as a creator make him *invent* the world in which he works in advance; he anticipates it; these anticipations (this faith in truth) is his mainstay." (*Ibid*, 61).



He attempts to explain the growth of intellect as a development of the Will to Power. In the attempt he is largely swayed by the theory of biological evolution, and the belief that intellect is itself a product of those physical forces seen in natural development.

At the same time he betrays the influence of Kant in magnifying the human forms involved in all knowledge.

Again, denying the "thing in itself" he dragged it back into existence in the shape of the *Will Power*. In other particulars he shows the influence of Kant.

Similarly Nietzsche, at one time a devotee at the shrine of Schopenhauer, came violently to differ. Still he never shook off the influence of the sage of pessimism. Along with Schopenhauer he taught a monism of the will, as Hegel had taught a monism of thought. Nietzsche is often utterly inconsistent but on the whole his philosophy is "monism with the individual a mere bubble on the stream of the Will to Power." While not a pessimist in the Schopenhauer sense his *Amor Fati*—love of recurrence—is a "counsel of despair." His differences with Schopenhauer have been explained as due largely to what he borrowed from Charles Darwin, whom nevertheless he also treated with great professed contempt. "Nietzsche's conception of the world as physiological development only—his never ceasing belief in evolution—even his belief in the struggle for power as the keyword to all development are really Darwin with a difference" (Figgis, *The Will to Freedom*, 193). It is claimed that he was probably indebted for his notion of the Superman indirectly to Darwin's *Origin of Species*. Dr. George Brandes, who has been called the discoverer of Nietzsche, teaches that his whole system of ethics is merely the translation into ethical terms of the Bismarckian Era.

If he was very marked for originality, the world has been slow to see it, except in his insane condemnation of morality.

V. *How does it come about that Nietzsche has won so considerable a following?*

He has won no small following, not only young men and young women who wish to live free of traditional restraints, but philosophic "students" who differ with him on some points radically, and professed Christians who deny the truth of his central teachings. Musicians and educators admire him for his introduction of them to wide horizons of culture and for his advocacy of the cultivation of positive energy. It is said that *Thus Spake Zarathustra* has reached a circulation of about 140,000; and that quite a library of books has been written on Nietzsche.

The explanation of the Nietzsche vogue may be in part:

1st. The enthusiastic dogmatism with which he sets forth the views which he for the time holds. He appears to be full of dead certainty that his illusions are the most useful possible for human life. No man ever thought more highly of his own mental children than Nietzsche of his "illusions." No man ever assumed a more dogmatic tone. He spake with the air of a prophet. He boasted of his prophetic gift. He blew his own horn as no other man ever did. In an age of negation the crowd is hungry for dogmatic affirmation.

2d. His imaginative, romantic, concrete, sensuous way of expressing himself has brought him into favor with many people. These qualities may be illustrated by the Night Song of Zarathustra:

"'Tis night; now do all gushing fountains speak louder. And my soul also is a gushing fountain.

"'Tis night: now only do all songs of the loving ones awake. And my soul also is the song of a loving one.

"Something unappeased, unappeasable, is within me; it longeth to find expression. A craving for love is within me, which speaketh itself the language of love.

"Light am I: ah, that I were night! But it is my loneliness to be begirt with light!

“Ah, that I were dark and nightly! How would I suck at the breasts of light!

“And you yourselves would I bless, ye twinkling starlets and glow-worms aloft!—and would rejoice in the gifts of your light.

“But I live in mine own light, I drink again into myself the flames that break forth from me.

“I know not the happiness of the receiver; and oft have I dreamt that stealing must be more blessed than receiving.

“It is my poverty that my hand never ceaseth bestowing; it is mine envy that I see waiting eyes and the brightened nights of longing.

“Oh, the misery of all bestowers! Oh, the darkening of my sun! Oh, the craving to crave! Oh, the violent hunger in satiety!

“They take from me: but do I yet touch their soul? There is a gap 'twixt giving and receiving; and the smallest gap hath finally to be bridged over.

“A hunger ariseth out of my beauty: I should like to injure those I illumine; I should like to rob those I have gifted—thus do I hunger for wickedness.

“Withdrawing my hand when another hand already stretcheth out to it; hesitating like the cascade, which hesitateth even in its leap—thus do I hunger for wickedness!

“Such revenge doth mine abundance think of: such mischief welleteth out of my lonesomeness.

“My happiness in bestowing died in bestowing; my virtue became weary of itself by its abundance!

“He who ever bestoweth is in danger of losing his shame; to him who ever dispenseth, the hand and heart becomes callous by very dispensing.

“Mine eye no longer overfloweth for the shame of supplants; my hand hath become too hard for the trembling of filled hands.

"Whence have gone the tears of mine eye, and the down of my heart? Oh, the lonesomeness of all bestowers! Oh, the silence of all shining ones!

"Many suns circle in desert space: to all that is dark do they speak with their light—but to me they are silent.

"Oh, this is the hostility of light to the shining one: un-pitifully doth it pursue its course.

"Unfair to the shining one in its innermost heart, cold to the suns—thus travelleth every sun.

"Like a storm do the suns pursue their courses: that is their travelling. Their inexorable will do they follow: that is their coldness.

"Oh, ye only is it, ye dark, nightly ones, that extract warmth from the shining ones! Oh, ye only drink milk and refreshment from the light's udders!

Ah, there is ice around me; my hand burneth with the iciness! Ah, there is thirst in me; it panteth after your thirst!

"'Tis night: alas, that I have to be light! And thirst for the nightly! And lonesomeness!

"'Tis night: now doth my longing break forth in me as a fountain—for speech do I long.

"'Tis night: now do all gushing fountains speak louder. And my soul also is a gushing fountain.

"'Tis night: now do all songs of loving ones awake. And my soul also is the song of a loving one." (Thus Spake Zarathustra, pp. 124-126).

There can hardly be a doubt that he understood the value of words, and that he handled them with the skill of a wizard. He had a good opinion of his style. He says:

"I will now pass just one or two general remarks about my *art of style*. To communicate a state, an inner tension of pathos by means of signs including the tempo of these signs—that is, the meaning of every style; and in view of the fact that the multiplicity of inner states in me is enorm-

ous, I am capable of many kinds of style—in short, the most multifarious art of style that any man has ever had at his disposal. Any style is good which genuinely communicates an inner condition, which does not blunder over the signs, over the tempo of the signs, or over *moods*—all the laws of phrasing are the outcome of representing moods artistically. Good style, in itself, is a piece of sheer foolery, mere idealism, like ‘beauty in itself,’ for instance, or ‘goodness in itself,’ or ‘the thing-in-itself.’ All this takes for granted, of course, that there exist ears that can hear, and such men as are capable and worthy of a like pathos, that those are not wanting unto whom one may communicate one’s self. Meanwhile my Zarathustra, for instance, is still in quest of such people—alas! he will have to seek a long while yet! A man must be worthy of listening to him. . . . And, until that time, there will be no one who will understand the art that has been squandered in this book. No one has ever existed who has had more novel, more strange, and purposely created art forms to fling to the winds. The fact that such things were possible in the German language still awaited proof; formerly, I myself would have denied most emphatically that it was possible. Before my time people did not know what could be done with the German language. The art of grand rhythm, of grand style in periods, for expressing the tremendous fluctuations of sublime and superhuman passion, was first discovered by me: with the dithyramb entitled, ‘The Seven Seals,’ which constitutes the last discourse of the third part of Zarathustra, I soared miles above all that which heretofore has been called poetry.” (Ecce Homo, pp. 62-64).

Professor Henri Lichtenberger says:

“His ‘writing’ is so neat and coloured, so nervous and flexible, so rich in picturesque expressions and in formulae, written and rewritten, chiselled with exquisite minuteness by a virtuoso of the pen.”

There is evident to the reader of the English translations a wierd music in some of Nietzsche's writings. Pictures, too, troop upon the heels of pictures. When one can forget the soaring self-magnification, the insane self-deification, and the Satanic impiety, the lure of Nietzsche's style is not inconsiderable. His pages are a rare picture-show, scene following scene with startling rapidity. He had the capacity of dealing even with dry academic subjects in the freshest way, placing them in beautiful settings, and throwing them into sensuous dress.

3d. He had the power of camouflaging the essentials of a subject with which he was dealing. In other words, he was a sophist of the first water. In profession he eschewed dialectic. In practise he was greatly given to a false dialectic. Thus, in picturing Christ he takes for his materials those passages in which Christ has been thought, by some, to teach the doctrine of non-resistance—takes them as teaching non-resistance—passes by the stern side of Christ, and, consequently, pictures him as a teacher of non-resistance pure and simple. Thus also, when opposing a series of arguments against a position he would maintain, he demolishes the weak and worthless so effectually as to make the superficial reader forget the strong arguments which he leaves discreetly untouched. He thus misleads many silly sheep.

4th. Dr. Figgis asserts that Nietzsche has power with men because he delivers them from the tyranny not only of the heaven above, but of the earth beneath; because he teaches them to live as though nothing were inevitable, as masters and not slaves of the universe, to find in it, even if they are worsted, a noble foe, to be ready for the new, the unknown, the exceptional, to climb daily fresh Alpine heights of danger—enslaved neither to priest nor to philosopher, nor even to scientific dogmatist. He says: "Jacob earned his royal title by wrestling with a supernatural be-

ing: Nietzsche, who denies the supernatural, would win for his pupils a like principality by teaching them to wrestle with natural reality. Rightly or wrongly, many have won this way a sense of freedom, of the worth of life and of trying" (Figgis, *The Will to Freedom*, p. 240-241). Yet Dr. Figgis himself teaches rightly that Nietzsche's cardinal tenets deny the possibility of this very freedom.

Figgis further claims that Nietzsche was the John the Baptist of the Twentieth Century—a new age:

"‘Repent,’ he might cry, ‘of your absurd morality. Rend all your garments, and live naked to the real wind. Rid yourself of shams; away with your conventional lies, your worship of comfort, your domestic pettiness, and above all your wallowing in pity. Be something. Look down, down on the herd, which you disown. Kill all this sentimental culture, this passion for the past, and join in the great gamble for the future, when every valley shall be a gulf, and every hill a Himalaya; when the crooked shall be twisted round, and the rough places become rocks. For Man, Man alone, shall be exalted in that day—for the Superman cometh, he cometh to judge the world, and with violence shall he rule the world and reprove with terror for the proud of the earth.’

"This note of appeal to the will, this sense that mankind is in the making, ushered in the twentieth century. The spirit of scepticism, of decadence had hold of many, or else a mere conservatism. Nietzsche was like the wild northeaster, and he was, in his own words, ‘the voice of the day after tomorrow.’" (Figgis, *The Will to Freedom*, pp. 250-251. Cp. *Ibid.*, 263).

5th. Without doubt his preaching of the class distinction between slave men and master men has been a trump card with junkers, and men anywhere suffering under the delusion of being "master men," or possibly supermen. It has been grateful to their egotism. They wish to see the age

of Dionysius come and the age of Christianity go--the age of the mastery of master men come and the age of regard for weaklings and slaves go; because forsooth they are the master men.

6th. His immoralism has given him popularity with some.

It enables the reader to bait Christians, and to deluge with contempt solemn academic moralists, who bethink themselves in no wise indebted to Christianity, though teaching its ethics. It enables some to give loose reign to every lust deemed fitted to build them up in bodily efficiency or any other sort of mastery.

Nietzsche is the apostle of positive ungodliness in revolt against the negative ungodliness of the scientists, philosophers, and critics of the nineteenth century. He was not only an *open* foe to Godliness, but he was a foe to this negative ungodliness. These critics had taken away the world's stimulus to life. Nietzsche did not restore the true stimulus--the Christian faith, hope and love. Woe is his that he did not. Into this negatively ungodly world he threw his stimulus, the hope of bringing in the Superman.

7th. In short, Nietzsche had the kind of stuff vast numbers of people in this age want--ungodly, atheistic, amoral, or immoral, dogmatic humbuggery--arid and bitter, desert sands in which they can bury their ostrich heads--that not beholding the great realities of life, they may live as though these realities were not.

VI. *What sort of fruits may be looked for from Nietzsche?*

1. The trampling of moral obligation in the dust.

If morality be due simply to the herd instinct, if the Superman is to be beyond good and evil every *asinus hominis* who fancies himself a master man, will tend to act as a Caesar Borgia, or a Napoleon, as the Junkers of Germany acted in Belgium and northern France--to use any means by which his ends may be accomplished. Man can only be-



come great at the cost of becoming morally terrible according to Nietzsche.

"Man is a combination of the beast and the super-beast; higher man a combination of the monster and the Superman; these opposites belong to each other. With every degree of a man's growth towards greatness and loftiness he also grows downward into the depths and into the terrible. We should not desire the one without the other; or, better still, the more fundamentally we desire the one, the more completely we shall achieve the other.

"Terribleness belongs to greatness: Let us not deceive ourselves." (The Will to Power, 405).

Their acceptance of his philosophy would explain all the sensual barbarism displayed by the German armies during the past four years. In further confirmation of this hear his words:

"The state, or unmorality organized, is from within—the police; the penal code, status, commerce, and the family; and from without, the will to war, to power, to conquest, to revenge.

"A multitude will do things an individual will not, because of the division of responsibility, of command, and of execution; because the virtues of obedience, duty, patriotism and local sentiment are all introduced; because feelings of pride, severity, strength, hate and revenge—in short, all typical traits are upheld, and these are characteristics utterly alien to the herd-man." (Will to Power, 184).

"The maintenance of the military state is the last means of adhering to the great tradition of the past, or where it has been lost, to revive it. By means of it, the superior or strong type of man is preserved, and all institutions and ideas which perpetuate enmity and order of rank in states, such as national feeling, protective tariffs, etc., may on that account seem justified."

He justifies beforehand every Machiavellian diplomatic move, the making of treaties to be treated as scraps of paper, and all beastliness of which Germany has been guilty.

2d. This world war—a war for world dominion is the fruit of his teaching, in part. He predicted it and furthered it by his teaching of amorality, his unceasing exhortation to the master class, to will to power, and by his magnification beyond measure of the inequality of races and individuals and his recognition of authority in any man's hands as in direct proportion to his power to secure the carrying out of his wishes.

VII. *What incidental benefits has Nietzsche conferred on Christianity?*

He has given occasions for Christians to see,

1st. That it is impossible to maintain Christian ethical standards without the Christian faith, that the ethics and doctrines are parts of one whole.

2d. That hatred to the Christian faith on the part of the natural man is a fact, that it will show itself in persecution again, as it has done before in case the type of Christianity becomes decided, and the natural man have the opportunity.

3d. That Christians, who profess to regard their fellows as equally entitled to life, liberty, and religion with themselves, should treat their fellows practically as if they believed it.

5th. That the Church and the world should be clearly demarked.

6th. That Nietzsche should be regarded as symptomatic of the time—a period of pagan-reaction against Christianity.

7th. That he has, by his caricature of Christianity occasioned a return from the Christianity that regards God as an indulgent old grandmother to a Christianity with a God merciful and terrible.







# Date Due

1	2	3	4
5	6	7	8
9	10	11	12
13	14	15	16
17	18	19	20
21	22	23	24
25	26	27	28
29	30	31	32
33	34	35	36
37	38	39	40
41	42	43	44
45	46	47	48
49	50	51	52
53	54	55	56
57	58	59	60
61	62	63	64
65	66	67	68
69	70	71	72
73	74	75	76
77	78	79	80
81	82	83	84
85	86	87	88
89	90	91	92
93	94	95	96
97	98	99	100





Processed Through a Century-Span Library



1 1012 01015 8113